The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

AND it came to pass that the time of the Coronation of the King drew nigh. And the Archbishops and the Bishops, the Deans and the Chapters, gathered themselves together. And the Archbishop spake and said:

"Lo, this is a great occasion, on which we should lift up the banner of Christ. The eyes of all men be upon us, and to them will we show that we are indeed and of a truth Christ's people. Did He not say that those who follow Him should take the lowest seat, and that whosoever humbleth himself shall be exalted?"

And the rest replied: "Even so".

And the Archbishops and the Bishops, the Deans and the Chapters, spake one with another and said:

"Far be it from us to take unto ourselves the glory of this great and solemn day. Let us therefore summon the quiet in the land, those whose praise is in the mouths of all men for their faithfulness, and invite them to conduct the Coronation of the King".

And it was so. And it came to pass on the day appointed by the King that the people called Quakers came together in the Ancient Abbey called Westminster, and there after their fashion in silent waiting did the King dedicate himself to his high calling. But no sound of hammer was heard, nor was the pomp of men of war and wealth to be observed. The Archbishops and the Bishops, the Deans and the Chapters, were indeed present, clad in sober raiment, and the Archbishop did read from the Word of God at the invitation of the people called Quakers.

And the people of the land sat up and took notice, and said:

"Verily the Archbishops and the Bishops, the Deans and the Chapters, are servants of the most High God, and indeed and of a truth followers of His Son, Christ Jesus".

And meanwhile there had gathered together also the Moderators and the Presidents, the Secretaries and the Chairmen, the leaders of those Christians which know not bishops. And they said:

"Be it far from us to urge that we should take part in the Coronation of the King. It were unseemly indeed for those of the Churches which stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free to cry aloud and make their voice to be heard in the streets demanding a place for themselves in the Ancient Abbey".

And they all agreed with one heart and voice. Nevertheless there

came a messenger from the Archbishops and the Bishops, the Deans and the Chapters, saying that those of the Churches called Free would be welcome when the King was crowned. And the Moderators and the Presidents, the Secretaries and the Chairmen, rejoiced in the gracious words which proceeded out of their mouths. But they said:

"It hath often been proclaimed from our platforms and announced to all mankind that those who labour unseen of men—the pastors in their churches in city and countryside, the laymen who give of their leisure and substance, do indeed the greatest service unto the Kingdom of God. Let us, therefore, search out men of good report, whom the world knows not, but whom God knows, and send them to the ancient Abbey for the dedication of the King".

And it was so, that at the solemn season when the people called Quakers conducted the coronation of the King, the men of good report, from the churches called Free, sat in the ancient Abbey with the Archbishops and the Bishops, the Deans and the Chapters. And the Moderators and the Presidents, the Secretaries and the Chairmen, sat at home with their families and listened in.

And the people sat up and took notice, and said:

"Verily the Moderators and the Presidents, the Secretaries and the Chairmen, are servants of the most High God, and indeed and of a truth followers of His Son, Christ Jesus".

And while these things were being done, the Editors and the Proprietors, the Directors and the Money Finders, of the papers men call religious met one with another and said:

"Do we not know in our hearts that those who do the hardest work on our papers—even that which is called 'donkey-work'—are those who read proofs, collect news, who come early and go late? We cannot but therefore send them to the Ancient Abbey to witness the ceremony of the dedication of the King".

And it was so. And the people marvelled most of all at this, to see at the ancient Abbey not the Editors and the Proprietors, the Directors and the Money Finders, but the reporters and the compositors, the sub-editors and the proof-readers. And they sat up and took notice, and said:

"Verily the Editors and the Proprietors, the Directors and the Money Finders, of the papers called religious, are servants of the most High God, and indeed and of a truth followers of His Son, Christ Jesus".

And so in the year that the King was crowned it was made plain to all men that Christians were indeed Christians; and when the people saw the Lord high and lifted up in the obedience and sacrifice of those who bore His name, they turned to Him walking and leaping and praising God; and there were added to the Church day by day those who were being saved.

* * *

LISTENING to *Henry V* at the Old Vic the other day we could not but wonder how little the representatives of the Church had moved in regard to war in five centuries. The Archbishop of Canterbury exhorts the King:

> Stand for your own; unwind your bloody flag;
> Look back into your mighty ancestors:

The Bishop of Ely backs him with the words:

> Awake remembrance of these valiant dead,
> And with your puissant arm renew their feats:
> You are their heir, you sit upon their throne;
> The blood and courage, that renowned them,
> Runs in your veins;

and the Archbishop, making his promise of a mighty sum from the clergy, implores the King to win his right "with blood, and sword, and fire". The result of such appeals by the clergy may be gathered from Henry's words to the Governor of Harfleur:

> The gates of mercy shall be all shut up;
> And the flesh'd soldier, rough and hard of heart,
> In liberty of bloody hand shall range
> With conscience wide as hell; mowing like grass
> Your fresh-fair virgins and your flowering infants.
> What is it then to me, if impious war,
> Array'd in flames, like to the prince of fiends,
> Do, with his smirch'd complexion, all fell feats
> Enlink'd to waste and desolation?
> What is't to me, when you yourselves are cause,
> If your pure maidens fall into the hand
> Of hot and forcing violation?
> What rein can hold licentious wickedness
> When down the hill he holds his fierce career?
> We may as bootless spend our vain command
> Upon the enraged soldiers in their spoil,
> As send precepts to the Leviathan
> To come ashore.

Our clerics still announce that the use of force is justified. Do they not realize that in modern warfare, even more than in ancient, their support of the use of force lets loose powers that speedily get beyond control, cruelties, immoralities compared with which those of the fifteenth century are mild indeed. How *can* war be humanized? Once allow national sovereignty, and a nation's right to secure its will by force, the horrors of Abyssinia and Spain are inevitable.

The Archbishop of York in his very useful pamphlet, *Christian Democracy* (S.C.M., 6d.), claims that the Christian's answer to the world's hate is "pure love . . . the cross of Christ"; "Christ and none other" is the "standard of judgment". How is this, we wonder, to be reconciled with advocacy of the legitimacy of the use of force,

came a messenger from the Archbishops and the Bishops, the Deans and the Chapters, saying that those of the Churches called Free would be welcome when the King was crowned. And the Moderators and the Presidents, the Secretaries and the Chairmen, rejoiced in the gracious words which proceeded out of their mouths. But they said:

"It hath often been proclaimed from our platforms and announced to all mankind that those who labour unseen of men—the pastors in their churches in city and countryside, the laymen who give of their leisure and substance, do indeed the greatest service unto the Kingdom of God. Let us, therefore, search out men of good report, whom the world knows not, but whom God knows, and send them to the ancient Abbey for the dedication of the King".

And it was so, that at the solemn season when the people called Quakers conducted the coronation of the King, the men of good report, from the churches called Free, sat in the ancient Abbey with the Archbishops and the Bishops, the Deans and the Chapters. And the Moderators and the Presidents, the Secretaries and the Chairmen, sat at home with their families and listened in.

And the people sat up and took notice, and said:

"Verily the Moderators and the Presidents, the Secretaries and the Chairmen, are servants of the most High God, and indeed and of a truth followers of His Son, Christ Jesus".

And while these things were being done, the Editors and the Proprietors, the Directors and the Money Finders, of the papers men call religious met one with another and said:

"Do we not know in our hearts that those who do the hardest work on our papers—even that which is called 'donkey-work'—are those who read proofs, collect news, who come early and go late? We cannot but therefore send them to the Ancient Abbey to witness the ceremony of the dedication of the King".

And it was so. And the people marvelled most of all at this, to see at the ancient Abbey not the Editors and the Proprietors, the Directors and the Money Finders, but the reporters and the compositors, the sub-editors and the proof-readers. And they sat up and took notice, and said:

"Verily the Editors and the Proprietors, the Directors and the Money Finders, of the papers called religious, are servants of the most High God, and indeed and of a truth followers of His Son, Christ Jesus".

And so in the year that the King was crowned it was made plain to all men that Christians were indeed Christians; and when the people saw the Lord high and lifted up in the obedience and sacrifice of those who bore His name, they turned to Him walking and leaping and praising God; and there were added to the Church day by day those who were being saved.

* * *

LISTENING to *Henry V* at the Old Vic the other day we could not but wonder how little the representatives of the Church had moved in regard to war in five centuries. The Archbishop of Canterbury exhorts the King:

> Stand for your own; unwind your bloody flag;
> Look back into your mighty ancestors:

The Bishop of Ely backs him with the words:

> Awake remembrance of these valiant dead,
> And with your puissant arm renew their feats:
> You are their heir, you sit upon their throne;
> The blood and courage, that renowned them,
> Runs in your veins;

and the Archbishop, making his promise of a mighty sum from the clergy, implores the King to win his right "with blood, and sword, and fire". The result of such appeals by the clergy may be gathered from Henry's words to the Governor of Harfleur:

> The gates of mercy shall be all shut up;
> And the flesh'd soldier, rough and hard of heart,
> In liberty of bloody hand shall range
> With conscience wide as hell; mowing like grass
> Your fresh-fair virgins and your flowering infants.
> What is it then to me, if impious war,
> Array'd in flames, like to the prince of fiends,
> Do, with his smirch'd complexion, all fell feats
> Enlink'd to waste and desolation?
> What is't to me, when you yourselves are cause,
> If your pure maidens fall into the hand
> Of hot and forcing violation?
> What rein can hold licentious wickedness
> When down the hill he holds his fierce career?
> We may as bootless spend our vain command
> Upon the enraged soldiers in their spoil,
> As send precepts to the Leviathan
> To come ashore.

Our clerics still announce that the use of force is justified. Do they not realize that in modern warfare, even more than in ancient, their support of the use of force lets loose powers that speedily get beyond control, cruelties, immoralities compared with which those of the fifteenth century are mild indeed. How *can* war be humanized? Once allow national sovereignty, and a nation's right to secure its will by force, the horrors of Abyssinia and Spain are inevitable.

The Archbishop of York in his very useful pamphlet, *Christian Democracy* (S.C.M., 6d.), claims that the Christian's answer to the world's hate is "pure love . . . the cross of Christ"; "Christ and none other" is the "standard of judgment". How is this, we wonder, to be reconciled with advocacy of the legitimacy of the use of force,

with the knowledge of all that force implies? How is it to be reconciled with the Church's presentation of the sword to the King at the Coronation?

* * *

It is fine to have a veteran scholar like Prof. G. A. Coe demanding courage and thoroughness in dealing with religious life and thought. In an essay in *Religion in Transition* he tells how he discovered that

> the freedom that liberal theology practised was freedom to weave merely the fringes of the garment.

He goes on:

> As time went on, a great hiatus revealed itself. Rigorous research with respect to the biblical literature, but no corresponding rigour with respect to the great issues of life and society that reach all the way from Old Testament times to the present; critical analysis of the Gospels, but uncritical encomiums upon the character of Jesus, and romantic assumptions as to His significance in history or in the cosmos; incisive history of the Church, but, with respect to the Church of to-day, acquiescence upon a basis that is both uncritical of contemporary ecclesiastical facts, and ethically complacent; proclamations that Christianity is a way of life rather than a set of beliefs, but failure to show how it differs from other, contemporary ways of life; a wide orbit in the upper air of concepts, together with unimpeachable sentiments, but here on the ground, enormous ethical conflicts and forces scarcely named in these concepts, and not controlled by these sentiments—all this was to unfold before me, and partly within me. It seems to me now that the liberal evangelicalism with which I have had many contacts has attempted to be religiously orthodox but theologically free. In this there is neither intellectual nor spiritual consistency, and of course there cannot be in it power to guide the course of events even within the Church, to say nothing of society at large.

The timidity which the Christian Church so often showed in the sphere of thought is even more marked in the sphere of economics where, in Prof. Coe's words,

> organized religion, on the whole, is either ambiguous or, at the point of decisive action, hesitant.

He has come to believe that

> without a revolutionary degree of change in our social order the old confident faith cannot be restored to vigour.

How many Christian people to-day, especially ministers and laymen who are supposed to be leaders in denominations and individual churches, are prepared to face this disconcerting fact?:

> our Churches as a whole and almost without exception (even of a local sort) ask only for the patching up of this economic system, not for any kind of revolution to end it.

The Churches, Prof. Coe says,

> are class institutions standing for the perpetuation of a class economy.

Efforts are made to save the Christian faith by turning away from the economic tragedy, or by palliative charity.

> Capitalism has no serious objection to such religion. The religious and the theological emergency can be met only by thought-structures and practices to which capitalism does object because they threaten its existence.

All who are on the inside of the life of the Free Churches in this country must admit the truth of these contentions. The laymen who take a prominent part in denominational affairs, often at a great sacrifice of time and money—they are often "the salt of the earth"—are invariably participants in the economic system of the time: the very leisure they use in the service of the churches, the monetary contributions they make to good causes, are the result of a capitalist system of society. By the very nature of the case "working-men" cannot serve on denominational committees, whose conservatism in political and economic issues is almost beyond belief. The gaping gulf between the views of the "leading laymen" and those, say, of the more fertile minds in the Christian Social Council is one of the most disturbing features of religious life to-day. It will, if care is not taken, mean that the cleavage between the Free Churches and labour will become irreparable. We have to face this situation:

(1) Organized religion is maintained by an economic system which even in prosperous times entails unemployment for millions of people, and poverty for millions more.

(2) Those millions of people and the working classes generally are outside of, and largely untouched by, the Free Churches.

(3) The leaders of the Free Churches are amazingly timid in discussing capitalism and its abuses, a timidity not unobserved by those opposed to religion in the Labour Movement.

The proposed National Defence Contribution—surely one of the most humiliating episodes in the life of any Government—indicated the line which will inevitably be taken sooner or later in the establishment of a fairer economic system, *viz.*, the limitation of the return on capital to six or some other fixed percentage. What will Christian employers and shareholders have to say when this proposal is made? Will organized religion have so set its house in order that its work can be done without the monies which accrue from an economic system which, tried by Christian principles, has been found wanting?

* * *

THE work of the London Missionary Society has always been the serious concern of Congregationalists, though for some mysterious reason the Congregational Union of England and Wales is only brought into close connexion with the Society's work in times of financial crisis. Such a time is the present: a deficiency of £17,000 last year, an accumulated deficiency of £76,000; this position the Society's constituency is called upon to face.

Anybody who knows the Society and the Congregational Churches is aware of two things:

1. That no Missionary Society in the world has a more glorious history than the L.M.S. Its roll of heroes is as striking as its record of steady and steadfast witness, and Congregationalism is right to take pride in its achievements.

2. No Society has had, and still has, in its home constituency more devoted and sacrificial support. It is literally true to say that there are few churches without those who think and pray and sacrifice for the L.M.S. in season and out of season.

In the light of these facts—and of the additional fact that youth is to-day volunteering for missionary work in such splendid fashion—why is it that there are these constant deficits? Why do the churches not respond to appeals made to them? In the answer to these questions lies the future of the L.M.S. We suggest the following points for consideration by the Directors:

1. It is only when the home churches are strong that they can maintain a powerful missionary enterprise. The finest appeal in the world will not extract money from empty pews, nor from those whose resources are completely exhausted in the struggle to maintain their own church work.

2. There is urgent need for the revolution taking place on the Mission Field to be expounded to the constituency. If the situation so finely presented by the Rev. William Paton in *Christianity in the Eastern Conflicts* could be brought home to Congregationalists they would have a more intelligent appreciation of the needs of to-day and to-morrow. The attitude of the student world in India and China, the relation of resurgent nationalism to missions, the refusal of governments to allow Christian teaching in schools, the rise of Communism, the growth of the indigenous church—these are but a few of the features in the missionary's background of which even some missionary enthusiasts seem only vaguely aware. The L.M.S. must show its constituency how it is adapting its policy and its technique to meet this entirely new situation.

3. Similarly a new technique is required in approaching the churches. Some think that if the L.M.S. were to appeal to Congregationalism, with a guarantee that there would be no more deficits,

the churches would rise to the occasion and raise the £76,000 to ensure a clean start. Others believe such a response is beyond the power of the churches as they are to-day. Nobody, so far as we can see, thinks that an appeal along the all-too-familiar lines has any hope of success, without an adequate attempt to convince the churches that the Society is putting its house in order and is prepared to make drastic changes and even revolutionize its methods where necessary.

4. It will have to be recognized that the present method of government and administration is obsolete and inefficient. How can a body of Directors some hundreds in number effectively control any Society? What would business experts say about the work of the L.M.S. if they were to survey its administration and study the minutes of its Board and Committees during the last ten years? Rightly or wrongly, the churches, with all their love for the L.M.S. and their desire that the work should expand and prosper, are at the moment disposed to be critical and have no enthusiasm about a new appeal for money. It will need statesmanship of a high order to bring an adequate response. Something more than threats of withdrawal and expert publicity is called for. If the chance to educate the constituency anew is grasped the whole missionary outlook of Congregationalism may be transformed and the churches will bring to the problems of a new world the devotion and genius which marked the missionaries of the heroic age.

To sum up then. What the churches see, or think they see, is a cumbrous and inept system of government and administration and an unwillingness to experiment in regard to co-operation with the Congregational Union, most of all evident perhaps in regard to publication departments. There is, therefore, a not unnatural exasperation in the churches, which have come to regard the L.M.S. not as their instrument in a grand and glorious enterprise, but as an indefatigable claimant for cash. Can the L.M.S. so expound missionary policy as to make Congregationalists recognize that it is as thrilling to meet the needs of to-day as to send out Morrison and Moffat, Chalmers and Williams? Can the L.M.S. develop a policy of sending Christians to India and China in all trades and professions, men and women who will be there primarily not to make a fortune but to spread the good news, to be cells around which Christian communities may gather? The Society's future depends on answers to these questions and so does the response of the churches.

* * *

More than once we have commented in these pages on the indispensability of the *Times Literary Supplement*. It still remains indispensable, even though it has made unhappy concessions to popular taste in the introduction of illustrations and a new format. Years ago we had reason to complain about the treatment of Free

Churchmen in its columns. We are sorry to have to revert to this topic. So many communications reached us in regard to an article on "The Five-Fold Growth of Theology" in the Special Number of May 1st, that we wrote to the Editor the following letter:

> In your valuable number last week one could not but regretfully contrast the article dealing with theology with the rest of the special articles, the masterly survey, "The Refashioning of History" in particular. The writer of "The Five-Fold Growth of Theology" seems to wear huge blinkers which prevent him from catching a glimpse of anything not immediately in front of him, namely, the Anglican Church. There is, it is true, a paragraph dealing with Roman Catholic theologians and an occasional mention of a scholar from Scotland: but the contribution of Free Church scholars to biblical and theological learning is completely ignored. Of those no longer with us, A. M. Fairbairn and P. T. Forsyth, A. S. Peake and George Buchanan Gray, H. R. Mackintosh and Robert Mackintosh, surely deserve some mention. Among others who are still writing one thinks of Drs. Bartlet, Garvie, Selbie, and Souter, Profs. R. S. Franks and H. Wheeler Robinson, Drs. John W. Oman and C. Anderson Scott, and among younger men Profs. C. H. Dodd and T. W. Manson. The Methodists could indicate Drs. Scott Lidgett, H. B. Workman, Vincent Taylor, and many others. It is characteristic of the writer that he mentions Mr. A. D. Nock's *Conversion* and ignores Principal Underwood's equally valuable book with the same title.
>
> Theological scholars of all the churches work happily together. It is a pity that the writer of your article so glaringly ignores much that has been and is being done by Free Churchmen.

This communication was not printed, but a letter came from the Editor in which he said it was not possible in a comparatively brief summary "to do justice to all the great names in English theology during the century", and enclosing the following comment from the reviewer:

> My blinkers must have dropped off when I mentioned Milligan, Moulton, Hastings, Drummond, William James, Pringle Pattison. Perhaps there are others, for I have never troubled to inquire to what religious confession many of the theologians named in the article belonged, nor do I propose to do so now. If I had been dealing with religion in the century, many of the names given by Dr. Peel would have called for comment, for their religious influence was great. But my subject was theology, which is a science, and I had to look for men who made advances in that science or led movements. The only person in Dr. Peel's list whom I think that perhaps I should have included is Dr. Vincent Taylor. This omission was an oversight, the others, in view of the limited space available, were deliberate. While I would have been glad of the opportunity

to have recorded the names Dr. Peel gives, I should necessarily have had to give many others as well of equal eminence. Among Anglicans, I should have been compelled to mention, for example, the Bishops of Durham and Gloucester, the Dean of St. Paul's, Canons Lacey, Barry, Mozley, and Quick, Drs. Pullan, Darwell Stone, and a host of others. But why look on theology as a matter of denominational prestige?

To this we sent a reply deploring the unwillingness of the editor to correct in his columns any unfairness or wrong impression. At the same time we replied to the reviewer:

> Your reviewer astutely endeavours to counter my criticism by stating he was writing of theology, not of religion, and implying that I look upon theology as a matter of denominational prestige. This really will not do. The article mentioned over fifty Anglicans and, I think, only three English Free Churchmen—Faraday, Martineau, Moulton. Apparently not a single Baptist or Congregationalist and only one Methodist made a contribution to theology in the years between 1837 and 1937 comparable to that made by any one of the fifty Anglicans. Your readers must be allowed to judge of the fairness of this. The article may be contrasted with Dr. Elliott-Binns's *Religion in the Victorian Era,* with which your reviewer may not be unacquainted. Reviewing this work I said: " . . . it is well-informed; fair, and sometimes even generous, to the Free Churches; and tolerant". It is a pity the same qualities do not mark the contribution to your pages.

The *Times Literary Supplement* should set an example of just criticism, and we cannot but regret its departure from its own generally high standard.

* * *

Our correspondent writes:

The Royal Academy does not rise to a Coronation Year: in fact the only suggestion of the Coronation is the special exhibition of portraits of Royal Patrons from George III to George VI. These include two portraits by Sir Joshua Reynolds, three by Sir Martin Archer Shee, Sir Edward J. Poynter's *Edward the Seventh,* Sir Arthur Cope's *George the Fifth,* and Mr. Simon Elwes's *George the Sixth.*

We were struck most of all by Mr. F. W. Elwell's interiors, of which there were five, including *The County Court, Beverley*; *Girl Polishing Pans*; *Girl Plucking a Goose*; and two of pigs. Pigs, indeed, are prominent in the Academy this year. The only interiors of the same quality as Mr. Elwell's are his wife's. Mr. Lamorna Birch's Landscapes and Mr. Julius Olsson's Seascapes lend distinction to the Exhibition: the former's *Seil Sound, the Glachan, Argyllshire,* and the latter's *The Storm Cloud* are specially noticeable. Mr. Harold Knight and Dame Laura Knight are well repre-

sented, the latter's outstanding picture being *The London Palladium*. There are some good portraits by Mr. Gerald Kelly, Mr. Gerald L. Brockhurst, and Mr. W. G. de Glehn.

The miniatures this year seem to be of special merit, especially those of the children. There are few mystery pictures, though two we found quite incomprehensible. Mr. George Belcher's two paintings are characteristic. Of religious pictures there are none at all apart from Mr. Russell Flint's *Naomi, Ruth and Orpah*. The Church is not so well represented as usual in the portraits, although there are one or two Bishops and Deans, and the new Bishop of Lichfield appears among the miniatures.

* * *

Our last issue seems to have added to the gaiety of nations. We thank all those readers who, with unseemly glee, have pointed out one mistake and two misprints. The price of Mr. C. E. Vulliamy's *Royal George* is 12s. 6d., not 1s. 6d.; the University of Witwatersrand is not the University of Witwaterstrand. More important, the conjecture that the Rev. Leslie S. Weatherhead had telescoped T. R. Glover and W. R. Maltby to make T. R. Maltby was wide of the mark. The late T. R. Maltby was a brother of W. R. Maltby and the author of *Studies in St. Mark*.

For these and all other shortcomings we eat humble pie; indeed, we abhor ourselves and repent in dust and ashes.

* * *

From Mr. J. S. Hoyland's *That Inferiority Feeling* we have extracted the following:

> "What kind of boys go to Heaven?" asked the Sunday School superintendent. "Dead boys", replied an intelligent member of his class.
>
> "I'm so sorry to hear of your husband's death", said the visiting parson to the lady who had recently lost a somewhat disreputable partner. "Remember, he'll be smiting a harp with the angels now". "Not 'e, Sir", she replied. "If I knows 'im, 'e's more likely to be smiting the angels with an 'arp".
>
> Asked to write what he knew about St. Paul's Cathedral, a small boy showed up this: "The dome of St. Paul's is supported by eight peers, all unfortunately cracked".
>
> A lad once translated *Il recommenda son âme à Dieu* by "He bade his donkey good-bye".
>
> A child was asked the old catechism question, "What is the chief end of man?" and replied, "The end with the head on".
>
> An American boy was once asked by his teacher the name of the first man. He replied, "George Washington". "What about Adam?" suggested the teacher. "Oh well, if you count foreigners—", was the supercilious reply.

WANTED: A CHRISTIAN WAY TO DEAL WITH DIFFERENCE OF CONVICTION.

By Dr. William Adams Brown
(*New York*).

I. Three Ways of Dealing with Difference of Conviction.
II. Examples in the Political Sphere.
III. The New Factor Introduced by Religion.
IV. The Method of Faith and Order and its Limitations.
V. How the Method of Life and Work Differs from that of Faith and Order.
VI. Wanted: A New Technique for Dealing with Difference of Conviction.

I. Three Ways of Dealing with Difference of Conviction.

There are three ways in which we may deal with those who differ from us in conviction. We may fight them. We may ignore them. We may try to understand them. And when I speak of understanding I do not mean simply the understanding that comes through the mind as belief is compared with belief and argument set over against argument, but that deeper understanding which is born of sympathy, as one looks into the heart of his neighbour and appreciates the motives which lead him to think, to act, and above all to feel, as he does. It is lack of such understanding which is responsible for much of the bitterness and suspicion which separate men to-day. It is only through such understanding, with the sympathy and co-operation which it makes possible, that men who honestly differ can live and work together with mutual self-respect.

It does not follow that the differences which have hitherto separated men will disappear or that understanding will minimize their importance. On the contrary, it may prove that understanding will accentuate the sense of their seriousness. What is certain is that the attitude which men take towards those from whom they differ will be changed. They will respect the convictions of others, even when they do not share them; when, indeed, they may feel it their duty to oppose them. And this respect, the tribute which is due to sincerity wherever found, will make friendship possible even across difference, and may even, through the removal of preventable misunderstanding, open the way to common action in the zone of agreement.

In the past the first of the three ways of dealing with differences of conviction has been on the whole the prevailing one. It has been generally assumed that of two possible beliefs only one could be right; and where these beliefs have concerned matters which bore directly upon the welfare of the holders it was natural, indeed it was

almost inevitable, that those who took one view should do all in their power to oppose and if possible to suppress the other. So as we retraverse the history of human thought we find the advocates of rival views meeting their opponents in the spirit of Cato to the enemies of his country and, where argument has proved unavailing, resorting to the more primitive method of the prison and the stake.

Almost equally common has been the second method: instead of opposing the view which seems to us wrong, we may simply ignore it. If others choose to hold it, that is their affair. It does not concern us so long as they allow us like liberty. There is a wide range in which this method of mutual tolerance proves entirely feasible, and there are many who practise it. The world of most men is a narrow one, bounded by their family or their community or their occupation. What men of other localities or trades may think may for the moment interest or amuse them, as what is strange always excites curiosity; but it would never occur to them to take their neighbours' beliefs seriously. So little worlds of thought grow up, like the islands of an archipelago, adjacent but self-contained.

Yet neither the one nor the other of these ways of dealing with difference proves permanently satisfactory. The method of conflict is unsatisfactory since conflict may lead to defeat. I am not the only one who thinks his view the true one and is willing to go to all lengths to make it prevail; and where conviction meets conviction, there is no certainty of the outcome. Even if for the time my view prevail, I have no guarantee that the victory will prove permanent. History is full of examples of beliefs once deemed dead which have come to life again. The barbarians conquered Rome only to make their own the religion and the laws of the people they had conquered.

Nor is the method of ignorance permanently practicable, for the boundaries within which men try to confine their lives are being continually overpassed. War, trade, travel, the pressure of social and economic need, are continually dislodging men from their original homes and so detaching them from their former habits of thought and practice. Whether we like it or not, sooner or later our neighbours' beliefs will force themselves upon our attention and we shall be obliged in one way or another to come to terms with them.

It is not external considerations merely which make us aware of our need for a new and better way of dealing with differences. Situations often arise which make the understanding of others' views a necessity of our own inner life. It may be that we discover some flaw in our own thinking and feel the need of correction from some outside source. It may be that contact with other lives reveals some unsuspected point of sympathy that breaks through the barrier which has hitherto separated us and introduces us into a new world. However it comes about, we are led to realize that we are not in possession of the whole truth and that our duty towards those from whom we

differ must be radically reconsidered. Where conflict seemed inevitable, co-operation becomes possible. More than this, it becomes indispensable.

II. Examples in the Political Sphere.

We may illustrate these contrasted attitudes in the political sphere. Thus far we have been speaking of differences of conviction as if they were exclusively a matter of individual concern. But man is not an individual only, holding his convictions in independence of his fellows. He is a member of society and his beliefs are affected in a hundred ways by the beliefs of his neighbours. When, as often happens, these beliefs lead to action, the matter becomes one of social as well as of individual concern. So we find governments putting pressure upon their citizens to prevent the expression of opinions which they regard as dangerous to public welfare and using the school and the press to mould sentiment in support of the policies they regard as essential.

The methods by which this pressure is exerted vary widely, as well as the extent to which it is carried. States, like the individuals who compose them, differ in their way of dealing with differences of conviction. Some are suspicious of difference and suppress it so far as possible. Others are tolerant and permit the freest expression of opinion. Contemporary Russia is an example of a State which has carried the control of public opinion to the limit. The Germany of Hitler is another. In Russia and in Germany the expression of any view which is critical of the accepted party philosophy is regarded as treason to the State. England, on the other hand, grants the widest possible liberty of utterance. So long as the word spoken is followed by no overt action the government declines to interfere.

If each State were a self-contained unit, this difference in policy might be regarded as a matter of domestic concern and each government be left free to deal with the control of public opinion as it wished. But States, like the individuals who compose them, are themselves component parts of a larger whole. They are members of a society or commonwealth of nations whose interests impinge upon one another in countless ways. Thus it is not a matter of indifference to England what people think in Russia or in Germany, for what people think in Russia and in Germany affects their actions, and their actions may take forms which are inimical to England's interests. So the problem which we have already encountered in the life of the individual—how to deal with those who differ from us—re-appears in the life of the nation; and here again there seem to be three methods between which a State must choose. It may fight for its beliefs in order to make others accept them. It may tolerate the beliefs of others as the price of a similar concession to its own. It may try by mutual understanding to transcend the barriers of differ-

ence, so that even though difference may still exist it will no longer prevent common action to mutual advantage.

We may illustrate the effects of these different procedures by two episodes in the history of Great Britain : her treatment of the Colonies at the time of the American Revolution, and her attitude towards the self-governing Dominions to-day. In each case we find sincere differences of conviction in matters affecting the national welfare. But in the former case the method which Britain adopted to make her will prevail was that of armed conflict, and the result was the loss to Britain of one of her most important colonies. In the latter case there has been no attempt to use constraint. The representatives of the Dominions have been invited to sit down with the representatives of the Mother Country at a common table, that in free discussion they may work out some solution which is to the advantage of all.

What Britain is attempting in her dealing with the members of the British Commonwealth, the League of Nations has been trying to do for the civilized world as a whole. The League of Nations may be described as the most ambitious effort that has so far been made to deal with the world's political differences by the method of understanding. The representatives of the different nations are asked, without sacrifice of sovereignty, to sit around a common table for the discussion of their differences in the hope that some solution may be found which will be to their mutual advantage.

There are two obstacles which have hitherto limited the success of this experiment. One is the fact that nations which refuse to tolerate the expression of free opinion within their own borders in matters that conflict with the will of the majority find it hard to substitute any other method in their dealing with other nations. Even when they make the attempt, as they are doing to-day, their motives are apt to be called in question. But where motives are suspect, the conditions are lacking which make mutual understanding, and so mutual confidence, possible.

The other difficulty is the result of too little control, rather than of too much. It is the instability of policy to which nations are liable which carries the democratic principle to its logical conclusion. For mutual confidence, more is needed than the goodwill of the moment. We must be assured that those who have promised are able to perform their promise, not simply now, but next year, and in the years that follow. This guarantee the statesmen of democratically-governed countries are often unable to give. The failure of the United States to implement Wilson's promise at Versailles is only the most extreme example of a weakness to which all modern parliaments are subject and which goes far to explain the rise of dictatorships in Russia, in Italy, and in Germany.

In the light of these facts it is not hard to understand the present weakness of the League of Nations. An experiment which was full

of promise, could it have been carried out in good faith, seems in danger of failure because the conditions which could alone insure its success are lacking. So instead of understanding we find suspicion, and where the subjects of suspicion are armed States smarting under a sense of injustice and grievance, suspicion breeds its inevitable aftermath in fear.

III. The New Factor Introduced by Religion.

It is against this background that we must set the differences which we encounter in the field of religion. All the phenomena that meet us in our study of difference in general re-appear here; but religion introduces a new factor which gives these differences more serious significance. In religion, so religious people believe, we are dealing not with human experience merely, but with divine revelation. Any departure from religious truth therefore is not simply a misuse of human responsibility; it is a violation of the will of God.

This explains the intolerance which has been so noticeable a feature of religious controversy. Where I am dealing with false doctrine it is not optional with me whether I shall surrender my conviction. It is not my will which is at stake but the will of a higher. Where God has spoken there can be no compromise.

And if all were agreed where God had spoken, and what, when He had spoken, the message meant, matters would be comparatively simple. But even the most cursory reading of the history of religion shows that this is not the case. Those who claim to be God's spokesmen are many, and their message does not always agree. So man's perennial problem—how to deal with differences of conviction—recurs in the religious field with added intensity.

Over wide areas of religious history the method of conflict and the method of indifference have had the field to themselves. Either men, certain that they were themselves in possession of the truth of God, have waged ceaseless war upon all who departed from their understanding of that truth, or, granting to others the liberty they claimed for themselves, they have withdrawn into the citadel of their own souls, that through immediate contact with the divine they might win the certainty of which they were in search. Only in comparatively recent times has the conviction gained a footing that in religious controversy too a third method was practicable: that through co-operative study in an atmosphere of understanding and sympathy it was possible to find a way to transcend differences of religious conviction.

Many different influences have combined to bring about this result. The growth of the scientific spirit has been a potent factor. It is of the genius of science that it should approach the study of phenomena in every realm with an open mind. The application of this method to the study of religion has not only revealed unsuspected similarities between the different religions; it has shown that much

which they had accepted without question as divinely revealed is simply human inference based upon an imperfect acquaintance with the facts. This discovery has led men to be more modest in their claim to possess the whole truth, more ready to learn from others whose experience and training has been different from their own.

More far-reaching in its effects has been the discovery of the limitations of our knowledge, the result of our better acquaintance with the extent of the non-rational factors which determine conviction. Recent psychological research has taught us how largely our beliefs are determined by suggestion, how much is contributed to our philosophy of life by that elusive factor we call temperament. We see now that the differences which divide us are not intellectual merely nor even mainly, but are in large part the result of the disposition with which we were born and the environment in which we were brought up. The subconscious causes which, operating in the political field, make men imperialists or democrats have their parallels in the religious sphere. There are men of whom we can say that they are by nature Catholics, and there are others who are Protestants from their birth. These differences of type cut across the historic religions and reveal unsuspected affinities between men of different faiths. So the Christian, Andrews, finds in the Hindu, Gandhi, a kindred spirit, and in their common faith in God they discover a bond of union which makes each at home in the experience of the other.

It would be easy to conclude that the differences that separate religious people are negligible and the controversies of theologians so much waste of good paper. But such a conclusion is premature. When every allowance has been made for the similarities between the different religions there remain important and far-reaching differences, and these it is necessary to explore with the thoroughness they deserve.

IV. The Method of Faith and Order and Its Limitations.

It was the search for such a technique that gave the World Conference held at Lausanne in 1927 its unique significance. That Conference, it will be remembered, was called to consider the differences in faith and order which still separate Christians. The themes with which it dealt—the creeds, the ministry, the sacraments—have been the subject of ecclesiastical controversy during the centuries, and innumerable councils have met to register their views on the questions at issue. But the Conference at Lausanne differed from its predecessors in its philosophy. The bishops who met at Nicaea and Chalcedon believed that God had revealed His will on the subjects in dispute in such clear cut and unmistakable fashion that all who differed from the view officially promulgated by the dominant party in the Church were to be deemed heretics, and as such to be

banned from its councils. But those who met at Lausanne were more catholic in their view. They did not believe that any one branch or party in the Church possessed the whole truth. They were convinced that each branch of the Church had received from God some revelation of His truth and that unity, if it were ever to come, must come by the way of comprehension, not of suppression. They set themselves therefore, in the spirit of fraternity, to explore the differences that separated them, in the hope that through comparison of divergent views they might gain new light upon God's will for his Church in our own day. The results reached more than justified the faith which had prompted the attempt. Differences remained, but their significance had altered. They were seen to be the sincere convictions of men who, because loyal to the truth as God had given them to see it, could be recognized as fellow-Christians for whom it was imperative to find some place in the one Church. So even though organic unity was not yet possible and at some points the difficulties in the way were even accentuated, the spirit of unity and the motives for the further exploration of a basis of agreement were reinforced.

Yet with all recognition of the progress made at Lausanne and the sincerity and goodwill of those who participated in its discussions, it laboured under two serious disadvantages. One was the limitation of the scope of the discussions to questions of faith and order, the other the lack of any provision for putting the differences which the discussions disclosed to some practical experimental test.

The Conference at Lausanne was called for a definite purpose, namely, to discuss the differences of Christians in a particular field. Its aim was to devise a plan of organic union which would remove the obstacles which divide the Churches in their attitude to creed, ministry, and sacrament. All else lay beyond the scope of immediate consideration. Other Conferences, like that called at Stockholm two years previously, might deal with questions that affected the life of the Church and its work; but these, we were continually reminded, were not our responsibility at Lausanne.

But such delimitation of territory, however convenient in logic, is fatal in practice. The unity of the Church is primarily a unity of life, and it expresses itself in work and worship as well as in belief and in church law. To isolate the discussion of doctrine and of the ministry from that of Christian experience and practice is to divide what God has joined together. Inevitably the discussion assumes an academic, not to say a legal, character. What is worse, when differences appear there is nothing to be done about them. Since action is ruled out, there is no room for the fresh experiment which might break the deadlock and make the next step possible.

It is ground for encouragement therefore that in the plans for the next meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order, which

is to be held in Edinburgh in August, this limitation has been removed. Besides commissions on the faith of the Church (the Church and the Word) and its order (the ministry and the sacraments), provision has been made for a third commission on the unity of the Church in life and worship. This commission will not only consider the relation of the outward unity of the Church in faith and order to the inward spiritual life of which these are the expressions and fruit, but in particular will seek to determine what steps are practicable, pending the consummation of complete institutional union, to bring to clearer expression the measure of unity which already exists between Christians in spite of their outward divisions.

V. How the Method of Life and Work Differs from that of Faith and Order.

Two years before the Conference on Faith and Order assembled at Lausanne another group of Christians met at Stockholm to consider how they could bring their common faith and life to effective expression in action. This practical interest appears in the name under which the Conference was called—the Universal Conference on Life and Work. Those who were sponsors of that Conference did not underestimate the magnitude of the differences which separated the various branches of the Christian Church or the seriousness of the issues which they raised; but they were convinced that underlying these differences and transcending them were certain common convictions and loyalties which made the Church in the truest sense one, and that their basic unity must be expressed in deed if the witness of the Church was to be efficacious and its message understood.

So the Conference set itself to explore the practical tasks before the Church, to define its agreements and its differences in its understanding of Christian duty, and to set up the machinery through which, so far as agreement was present, it could be translated into appropriate action.

The twelve years which have passed since the adjournment of the Stockholm Conference have seen significant achievement. The Continuation Committee which was appointed to explore the possibilities of further concerted action has become a Council, which has found it possible not only to think but to act for the Churches. It maintains a Department of Research, through which it conducts co-operative studies of matters of interest to its constituent bodies (*e.g.*, the relation of Church and State, the Christian view of the nation, *etc.*). It has an excellent and widely used *Information Service*. It has more than once served as the voice of the Churches on such matters as disarmament, the opium traffic, and the Minorities Question. When the Christians of Germany have dared to protest against the restraint put upon their liberty by the State, the Council

has been the channel through which the sympathy of their fellow-Christians has been communicated to the authorities of the German Church. Most recently it has organized an International Seminar at Geneva which brings together students of different countries and Churches for the study of the bearing of Christian principles on international affairs.

But, useful as have been these accomplishments, they are modest when compared with the expectations which were entertained by those who first called the Conference: "The Conference", so they summed up their ideal in 1927[1],

> has deepened and purified our devotion to the Captain of our Salvation. Responding to His call "Follow Me", we have in the presence of the Cross accepted the urgent duty of applying His Gospel in all realms of human life—industrial, social, political, and international.

When one compares this ringing sentence in the Stockholm Message with the subsequent accomplishment, one feels a sense of disillusionment, almost of dismay.

What is the explanation of the contrast between ideal and attainment? There are many reasons, no doubt; but the basic reason is this—that when the attempt was made to pass from words to deed, it was discovered that there were honest differences of conviction between those who adopted the platform of Stockholm as to what it implied in detail. These differences had to do partly with differing conceptions of the extent of the Church's social responsibility, partly with lack of agreement as to what the Church's witness should be even in that field of agreement.

These differences, implicit from the first, have been brought into the foreground by recent happenings in Germany. In the struggle between the two parties in the German Church there is involved, so we are coming to see more clearly every day, not only the question of the relation of Church and State, but the larger question of the extent and nature of the Church's responsibility to the existing social order. This is not a question which is exercising the Church of Germany alone, but in different ways is making its presence felt in every country. What is the measure of the Church's responsibility for social change? At what point does man's duty as a citizen cease and that as a Christian begin? Is there any necessary conflict, and, if not, how is the true relationship to be defined? These are not unimportant or peripheral questions, but carry us into the very heart of the Christian religion.

So those who have been responsible for shaping the policy of the Council on Life and Work have found themselves more and more forced back upon those ultimate questions as to the nature and function of the Church with which their colleagues of the Faith and

[1] Bell, G. K. A., ed., *The Stockholm Conference 1925* (London, 1926), 711.

Order Conference have been concerned. The hard and fast line which at first was drawn between the theory of the Church and its practice proves an untenable line. Underlying the specific issues faced both by Faith and Order and by Life and Work are seen to be deeper issues common to both, such issues as the nature of the Church and its place in God's plan for the world.

But this discovery only accentuates the need to which this paper is designed to call attention, the need for the discovery of some truly Christian way to deal with differences. We need it, in the first place, to discover what our differences are. We need it, in the second place, to discover how far those differences are likely to prove permanent, how far they may be overcome by fuller knowledge and deeper consecration. We need it, finally, to show us what is the Christian way to act in the face of apparently insurmountable difficulties.

VI. Wanted: A New Technique for Dealing with Difference of Conviction.

What we need, then, is to discover in the religious sphere some substitute for the experimental method of science. The amazing progress which has been made in the physical sciences has not been achieved by thought alone. Much as science owes to the speculations of the theorists, these speculations would have remained unverified hypotheses if they had not been put to the test of life. It is in the laboratory that the great victories of the scientists have been won, and co-operative experiment is the technique through which they have translated conjecture into certainty.

The laboratory of religion is the life of the Church. Centuries ago Jesus put His seal upon the experimental method when He made obedience the test of truth. "If any man will know of the doctrine", He said to His disciples, "let him do the will". We have learned that this is true in the life of the individual. It remains to find a way in which this principle can be applied in the life of the Church.

All that this means we cannot consider here. But we may at least suggest what are some of the more important lines of approach.

First of all we must be clear as to the extent of our existing agreements both as to the convictions which in fact unite the Church and the consequences which follow from them. This is the task to which Faith and Order and Life and Work, each in its own way, have been addressing themselves in the past. It should be continued and carried to completion, and its results should be made available to all in easily accessible form. In the great encyclicals the Roman Church makes clear its attitude on many controversial issues. There exists, in the pronouncements of the leading non-Roman Churches, a mass of material on contemporary religious issues, but they have not as yet been adequately correlated and interpreted.

In like manner, we need a systematic study of the practice of the

different Churches in the whole field of the application of Christian principles to life. Here again there is a body of experience which is available for our guidance, but it has not yet been assembled in convenient form for use.

When we pass from points of agreement to points of difference, we reach a more difficult field. Here it is clear that progress is possible only as we gain new experience which will make possible the modification of our existing positions. Such experience can only be gained through fresh experiment, and this both in the field of worship and of service. Such experiment, if it is to be successful, must be co-operative; but co-operative experiment in the field of common worship (*e.g.*, intercommunion) is rendered difficult by the laws of many of the Churches which limit action to what has been customary in the past. Such limitation not only fails to do justice to the measure of light which God has actually vouchsafed to His Church, but, what is more serious, prevents the only possible form of action which could be taken to overcome it. Where such limitation exists it should be removed by the action of the appropriate authoritative bodies.

Above all, action is needed in the field of agreement. This may require in some cases the setting up of new agencies of administration; and where this is necessary they should be provided. But for the most part what we need is not new agencies but the will to make adequate use of the agencies we have. If even now we were to act upon the convictions we profess, we should be surprised both at the measure of unity which would be revealed and at the extent of the progress that would become possible.

For of this we may be sure, that a faith that does not express itself in work is dead. The sin of which the Church most needs to repent to-day is not that where sincere differences exist those differences are recognized in the law and practice of the different Churches. It is rather that where agreement exists this has been followed by no appropriate deed. Wide areas of such common agreement exist to-day in the Church's faith, in its worship, in its experience, and in its conception of its duty to its own members and to mankind. The fact remains that in all these areas, even where there is no theoretical obstacle to common action, that action is not taking place. How can we expect to make progress in reducing the points at which we differ when we do so little to make effective the points on which we agree? How can we expect those to whom we speak of the duty of coming together to take our words seriously when we ourselves fail to practice what we preach?

SIXTY YEARS IN A PEW.

By H. B. Shepheard, M.A.

It is one of the advantages of later life that we can look back on the past, or at least upon its nearer fifty or sixty years, with knowledge, and not fancifully as the young will do. If our memories begin after Victorian or Edwardian times, we are likely to imagine vain things concerning those dim and dated ages; as though men and women were not much the same always, now as then; as though religion was not always one and the same thing, from the beginning. But looking back with knowledge, and recovering in memory the journey of our own experience, we can see with some certainty how much or little we are like our fathers and forefathers, in our religious faith and in its application. Fifty years ago what did they, and we, believe? And how did we, and they, in practice exercise our faith? And what do we believe to-day? Has our Christianity found another meaning and challenge? Has it grown, broadened, deepened? Or faded and lost its old certainties and intensities? And, again, can we, following in mind their past trend and direction, foretell the future of our faith and works? In fifty years what have we lost and gained, and what are our hopes or doubts for the future?

Looking back, then, while I must write of my own experiences during the last sixty years, it will not be to indulge in anecdotes about preachers or office-bearers whom I have met, but to contrast old things with new. I sat in my first pew, or rather stood upon its seat, sixty-three years ago, in Allen Street Chapel, Kensington, on the occasion of an infant sister's baptism. I can still see the building, vast as it then seemed to my small person, the scattered people, and Dr. Stoughton, old and white-haired, bending over the child. After that memory fades; I recollect neither sermons nor preachers, nor deacons nor sidesmen, nor doctrine nor good works, only dozing on hard seats through long discourses propped against my mother's seal-skin coat, until we removed to rustic Highgate. In the chapel there I sat, either in the family-pew, or in a long line of small boys, smartened with Sunday-best and plastered hair, under good Josiah Viney, very old and gentle, until, upon his due retirement, there succeeded to the pulpit a Welshman, one Morgan Gibbon, considered then to be, though eloquent, a somewhat dangerous innovator. But I do not remember being scandalized, except once, when, reading from *I Sam.* 6, he told us that the ark of the Lord came to rest, not at Kirjath-jearim, but at a strangely-sounding Kiriath-Yearim, one's first encounter with the liberties of critical scholarship. I joined the church at Highgate, after an interview, nervous on both sides, with a very senior deacon appointed for the purpose. But I am not writing

my personal religious history but recalling the varieties of my spiritual homes. Time would fail me to tell of Hampstead and Enfield and Purley, of Horton and Orchard, of Toms and Ebenezer Rees, of Pringle and Leslie Atkins, and of the multitude of occasional sermons heard, of books read, of group-thinking, and of fellowships enjoyed, which made up, imperceptibly often, the character of one's experience. But at least I must put on record the debt which I shall always owe, and can never fully acknowledge, to Dr. Horton. How we worked in those days—too hard I think now—three services every Sunday, week-nights at Kentish town, Young People's Societies, Choir-practices, besides the daily work and hard play; and being taught, line upon line, here a little and there a little, without shock or strain, as only he could teach, new conceptions, meanings, and spiritual perceptions, never realized before, never since forgotten. Though that was long ago and later modernisms went far beyond his halting-place, I believe that he understood—what we must, I think, all come to learn in the end, if our faith is to survive and evangelize all life—how to preserve the vital realities of religion, the things that have been true, always, from the beginning, however new knowledge may enlarge our outlook.

That was forty years ago: and, though the ministries under which I have sat represented many varieties of opinion, from extreme fundamentalism to the most advanced modernism, it was not in a progression following, chronologically, the general development of religious thought through those sixty years. But I think I can say that, while some to whom I listened halted between two opinions, some were silent, others found a middle way and some were uncompromising in their convictions, or doubts, it is possible to look back on one's experience and fairly contrast what was generally believed fifty years ago with later beliefs; and, in that contrast, discover, perhaps, what we have gained, or lost, in faith and works.

What did our fathers believe fifty years ago? Their faith was fundamental, definite. The Word of God, recorded in the Bible, was its authority. For the Catholic, truth is founded upon the rock of Peter and of the Church: for the Protestant, upon the Bible; and that the Bible may be infallible in its authority it must be divinely and directly inspired. It was the conclusive evidence of God's Will and Purpose and Nature. No more than the Catholic did we then recognize the right of private judgment: as much as the Catholic we believed in authority, but of the Bible, not of the Church; and of the whole Bible. We had no thought then of progressive revelation. The God of the Patriarchs, of the historic books of the Old Testament, or of the Prophets, and the Heavenly Father revealed to us by our Lord, was one God. Indeed, if we were aware of inconsistency, our chosen God was the holy, just, and righteous Jehovah, who favoured His peculiar people and avenged His broken laws, who

required atonement, even to the death of His only Son upon the Cross. The human race, we believed fifty years ago, was fallen into condemnation: we were every one of us tainted by an original sin: but—this was their supreme text—"God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son", and He had prepared His Plan of Salvation, expounded by Paul to the Romans—through repentance and the remission of sins; by claiming God's mercy at the foot of the Cross, where, as for Bunyan's Pilgrim, the burden of sin and condemnation is rolled from off the sinner's shoulders, into the Pit, for ever. We believed in sin in those days. Perhaps the things we called sin were sometimes other people's excesses which we ourselves had no temptation to commit, or perhaps were natural instincts cruelly and harmfully repressed. Perhaps we did not discern then —do we now?—the self-love, self-seeking, self-interest, half-conscious, or even unconscious, in us, which is sin itself. But we believed in sin in those days—in its reality; in man's prodigality and estrangement from His Father's House. We cried out: What shall I do to be saved? and knew something of that sense of forgiveness and reconciliation which has throughout the Christian ages been the experience of the great religious. We entered through the only wicket-gate into man's long and perilous journey to the heavenly city.

That is, of course, the very barest outline of our faith fifty years ago. I would only add that its root and foundation was in God's dealing with the individual soul. It was a personal religion—What shall *I* do to be saved? And after repentance and conversion and the acceptance of Christ's atonement, it was still individual and personal; a practice of prayer and worship and scripture-reading, a devout living, by which the individual soul, in the company of the like-minded, persevered in the Way, in expectation of a final bliss beyond the river. Such a faith bred great souls; fervent, always obsessed by sacred obligation, regular in religious observances, full of good works, scrupulous, whose lives in their devotion seem sometimes so far to have exceeded the common religious attainment of our times that it can only be with hesitation that one ventures any criticism.

But, nevertheless, it was a narrow and confined religion. For the moment I am not thinking of its theology. I mean that it was narrowed and confined in its application. It was personal, concerned with the individual's own salvation and sanctification. The Christian tried to love God with all his heart and soul and mind and strength. But did he forget the second great commandment, that he should love his neighbour as himself? And who was his neighbour? True, he was charitable. He gave to the poor, in money and service, but that, one must dare to say, was most often for the good of his own soul and in the exercise of its Christian virtues. Have I not heard, not so many years ago, a minister say that the poor are always with

us for that very purpose? Did we believe that our religion must go out abroad, into the wide world where our neighbour is everywhere to be found; into the secular world of business and economics, of industrial and international relationships? I am afraid not: that world was excluded from God's covenanted mercies. I have heard a good Quaker say, with some heat, that he would discuss religion with the religious and business with business-men, but he would not confuse the two things; and I have heard men say to-day that there must be no politics in the pulpit. But who is my neighbour? Not only the poor man at my gate whom I may comfort with gifts, but the out-of-work, the slum-dwellers, every man who has not had my privileges, whom indeed I am not loving, in reality and in fact, as myself, until I provide for him my good things, the means of health and education and employment which I have so richly enjoyed: and that I can never do myself, alone, who have neither the wealth nor knowledge nor power. Only the community, made Christian by political effort, by Christian politics—not party politics—preached in the pulpit and in the pew and in the train or the street, inspired, if need be, to overturn the world, as early Christians did, can set up a social economic and international order under which we shall at last be able to say that we are, in fact and in reality, Christians, loving our neighbour as ourself. Such a world-wide application of the Christian faith was far away indeed from the belief and practice of sixty years ago: far away, I fear, still from the purpose or wish of some to-day. Fifty years ago such things were attributed to a dangerous eccentricity. But that we can tolerate them better to-day, often accept them with all their revolutionary implication, is, I think, evidence that in fifty years we have at least won this much of enlargement, that we no longer can exclude secular things from God's Kingdom but dare to believe that business and economics, politics, the State and international affairs, no less than the individual soul, are within His operation. And that, we cannot but believe, is great gain.

We have been speaking of the enlargement of our Christian works. But what of our Christian beliefs? What, there, have we gained and lost? We laymen are not qualified theologians nor critics, but we can everyone appreciate the great gulf which gapes between the old fundamentalism and modernisms. I tried, very briefly and insufficiently, to outline the faith as received fifty years ago. But what did modernism, at its extreme, say, twenty-five years ago, before the War, believe? I find it very hard to answer. What *did* the extreme modernist believe? I could give negative answers, say what he did not believe. But what was his positive faith? He did not believe in authority; he had no infallible Church, nor divinely and directly inspired Bible. Every man must use such gifts and learning as he had, or could hear, to satisfy himself of the truth: for

the Bible was for him a book like any other, to be studied, criticized, textually or as literature and history, without presupposition or prejudice. He did not believe in the fundamentalist's God, holy, severe in His justice, to whom atonement must be made. His God was rather a Power and Purpose proceeding and moving in the evolution of all things and of man towards a far-off divine event: a Love too, not terrible and fatal to those who fight against it, but beneficent and kindly, even, if one may speak so, sentimental, which does not expect too much of us, its creatures. He did not believe that man is a prodigal estranged from heaven and God, nor that he is tainted with any original sin. Indeed he hardly believed in sin. Congregations would refuse to call themselves miserable sinners, sinners needing mercy. They even said, with a smile, that they were neither sinners, nor miserable. Yet, if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and do not know the truth of ourselves; and, if we are unaware of our darkness, may it not be because the light in us shines dimly? Sin, they said, is only a going astray, a missing of the mark, not an offence before heaven and in God's sight, nor a condition which only illumination and repentance and God's mercy can redeem; as the fundamentalist and, indeed, Christianity itself for nineteen hundred years has always declared. He did not believe in evil; the evil from which Jesus taught us to pray daily that we might be delivered. Evil, they said, is only the shadow which throws the light into relief, but shadow and light are both in God: it was unreality—and then the War came and the volcanic flames of pent-up evil burst out in their horror and dreadful reality over all Europe. I think that the War killed all such soft and comfortable religiosities. It showed us reality, shook us awake out of dreams of a world going happily on the sure stream of evolution to the sea. Rather it sometimes seems as though the last apocalyptic days had come and the hosts of Michael and all angels and of the Prince of this world were gathering to Armageddon. And can any vague, uncertain, faith, believing in it knows not what, save us in such a day?

You will be suspecting me of exaggeration, but I have heard and read these things with my own ears and eyes—as you have, surely—and remember them as well as I remember the extreme fundamentalism of fifty years ago. Both represent the outward limits on either hand of the swinging pendulum. But no pendulum can ever rest at its extremes: and religious thought can never be content with extravagances of credulity or dis-belief. There must be a point at which the pendulum is at rest. Or, there is a better metaphor, for our faith can never rest: it must never be content with present knowledge or experience. It must be always climbing to a wider outlook, as the winding steps of a tower climb within it, spirally, to higher and wider outlooks, until they issue on the open horizon seen only from the summit; except that, thank God, our climbing is never

ended. I think that the metaphor portrays the truth. At the foot of our tower a window looks out; the first, one way, on near and familiar things, on walled gardens, perhaps, and security. We linger there because we know it all so well and if others who have climbed higher call to us to come up and see from a window above new scenes, unused and unsafe, we are unwilling, disturbed, angry even—as the fundamentalist fears modernism. And the modernist at his new-found upper window, gazing out another way, upon country hitherto undiscovered, becomes, like the fundamentalist, absorbed and settled in his new views: the scene he looks upon is so much enlarged, varied, unconfined, that he is likely to forget the outlook from the lower window, though that was no less real; and there is so much that is new to see and to appreciate that he may linger at his window over long.

Why did religious thought abandon fundamentalism? Not I think because of any intellectual distress. We are not intellectualists. Nor because of the so-called conflict between religion and science. There never was, indeed, any such conflict. There was conflict, if you will—though how empty it seems to-day—between science and the fundamentalists' interpretation of *Genesis,* between Usher's dates and geological time, and so on, but none between religion and science. How could there be? They both seek Reality: and now that the battle has died down, we wonder what it was all about. Our faith does not depend upon our brains. If so, how few of us could be saved! Faith is the consent of the awakened spirit to truth. I think that fundamentalism lost its hold upon us for another reason. I once spent three weeks on holiday in the same house with a well-known agnostic. The only bitter thing I heard him say during that time was that his father had been an evangelical and fundamentalist clergyman and that the only good thing about him was his voice. He himself was, to use his own phrase, socially benevolent, engaged all his life in the study of economic conditions because he loved his neighbour more than himself. He was Christian on the manward side; but his father's religion, which made wide its phylacteries and tithed mint and anise and cummin, that went to Church three times a day on Sunday but on week-days believed that it was by God's ordinance that women worked in coal-mines and children twelve hours a day in factories was, manwards, a blasphemy. No wonder that he, and many, derided and abandoned it, upon any excuse, good or bad. Their reasons may have seemed to them to be of the mind. But I think that they were, in fact, of the heart and of the spirit.

But to-day, now that we too, with any humanist, have rediscovered the widest applications of our religious faith and have as keen a social conscience—and for better reasons—as he, do we not see now that, in our haste, perhaps we abandoned something that was still, as always, real and true in the faith of our forefathers, funda-

mental? We must be more than humanist if we are Christians. We can never believe that man lives by bread alone. Only God and the Kingdom of Heaven can satisfy him. Neither can our purpose be to establish some perfect State in this dying world: the Christian believes that man is an immortal spirit who belongs elsewhere. May I say it in the words of our Lord: that man is a son of God, Who is Spirit; but a prodigal son, estranged from his Father's house by his own sin, wasting his substance in a far country. But never forgotten. God sent His messengers and His only Son to redeem the world—that is the corner-stone of our faith, if we are Christians—and, because man still keeps the instincts of his origin and the signs of his noble birth, he can come to himself, and repent, and go home: and his new life seems easy because it is an old habit refound.

Every man's experience is his own. I suppose that we, as individuals, stand upon almost every step on the climbing stairway of religious belief: few, still at the lower window of fundamentalism: many clustering near the modernist outlook. But—and this is my last word—as we have during two generations found a far wider application of our Christian works, to our great gain, so we must not stand still in the progress of our faith. We must not be contented with what modernism has won for us, its liberality of mind and enlarged outlook. Liberty must not be licence, to believe anything or nothing. We must go on climbing: and the stairway is spiral: it returns upon itself at a higher level. To-day—I think that is the sign of the times—there are leaders calling us to follow them higher, to a new, but old, outlook, where from the next window the climber looks out again upon old things, which he had forgotten, but in larger horizons. We shall not misunderstand them because they are re-calling us to the essential truths of the Christian faith. They are not fundamentalists. They never were: they are not old enough even to remember what fundamentalism was. They have themselves long ago learned their modernism. But they are not content with anything less than that faith which, unless a man believes, he can hardly be called Christian. I mean that, as fifty years ago we could not be content with fundamentalism, so to-day modernism is not enough. We need the old truths again, the essential realities, which have been of the faith from the beginning. We must go on to rediscover them, in wider meanings and apprehension.

POLITICAL LIBERALISM AND THE EVANGELICAL FAITH.

By the Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith.

Writing a hundred years ago of the Liberalism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Mazzini declared: "We fell as a political party; we must rise again as a religious party". If the declaration is true at all it must be as true to-day as it was a century ago; and there must be many among us who believe that there is little hope of the resurrection of Liberalism unless it receive the quickening and consecration of faith. Nor is there any need to debate the presupposition to which such a belief must always point; namely, that our political principles are properly conditioned and nourished by our philosophy and theology. For clearly there is such a close connexion between politics and human nature that any political system presupposes, for example, a doctrine of Man. For is not human nature the raw material of politics, and does it not follow that any political system that is informed by a misconception of the human stuff is to that extent foredoomed to failure? It may be argued, for instance, that it was on this account that the doctrinaire theories of the French Revolution collapsed in actual practice. The conception of man as a noble political animal naturally perfectible under a *régime* of liberty and reason proved an unworkable theory of human nature. For a like reason the Russian Revolution is collapsing. The Marxian conception of man as an economic animal responding to economic stimuli under the supreme governance of economic determinism is proving itself inadequate. National Socialism, our modern democracies, the capitalistic system, and all conceivable economies must likewise submit to this selfsame test. If our doctrine of Man is wrong our politics and political expectations will likewise be wrong. And so, of course, with our doctrine of the world and of life. If we misread the meaning of the world, if we have a false conception of history and the goal of history, then all our political calculations must come to grief.

But the question which we have to consider in this paper is not so much the connexion between political Liberalism and Religion but specifically the connexion between political Liberalism and Evangelicalism. If it is true that political Liberalism can rise again only through the consecration of religious faith, what has modern Evangelicalism to offer?

Now of course the answer of those ultra-modern Evangelicals who have gone so far to the Left that they have moved round to the extreme Right would be that the question does not arise. "For God's

sake", exclaims Karl Barth[1],

> let there be no "Passionate Protestantism" . . . . ! Our strength is so to bear that we ourselves appear not at all, or at least only as men who remember and are rendered questionable. The best element in Paulinism is what is unmanageable and useless in it . . . . When Protestantism becomes "a factor to be reckoned with", when it attempts "to play a part", it has lost itself.

Evangelicalism, in other words, has no business to "offer" its faith for "the quickening and consecration" of any mundane movement; it can best fulfil its function in relation to this present world by removing itself to the outermost edge of society and world-culture (and of religion itself), and standing as a perpetual question-mark or note of exclamation over against all the "idealisms" of the times. And that there is occasion for this extreme Barthian protest who will dispute? We ought to know something by now of the futility of a fussy piety that must always be in some "movement" or other, and is so pathetically eager to identify the Kingdom of God with the latest reformist crusade. But to reduce, so far as this world is concerned, the significance of the Faith to a perpetual note of interrogation, or to vent its inspiration through monumental exclamation marks can hardly satisfy the Christian conscience—outside, at least, the closest circles of the Brethren. This earth also is the Lord's, and the processes of time, no less than the "Eternal Moment", have a divine significance. The Christian is also a man and a citizen, with duties toward this present world and with his own measure of responsibility for the social order in which he lives: and if he keep his politics and his faith apart he has fallen short of a true integrity.

Now assuming (as we do assume in this paper) that political Liberalism is susceptible of evangelical reinforcement, one consideration must be noted at the outset. Liberalism is not Gospel, it is Law. The boldest claim that can be made for it, evangelically, is that it is a preparation for the Gospel. It can witness to the divine order for the world; it cannot itself redeem the world. So that our Evangelicalism breaks at once with the romantic Liberal dream of salvation by progress. The vocation of Liberalism, as the Evangelical sees it, is not to lead the way along the ascending path of reform to some far-off evolutionary climax to which religious sentimentalism (but not the New Testament) gives the name of the Kingdom of God. There may be such a path and such a climax, but in itself it cannot mean the redemption of mankind; in itself this ascent of man may lead to a summit that is a crater.

To this consideration we shall presently return. It is enough to note now that precisely here the evangelical doctrine of Sin and of the Fall of Man opposes to a sentimental and deceptive political idealism the realism of the New Testament. It teaches that the human

[1] *Epistle to the Romans*, 525.

problem will not be solved by the elimination of the hated *bourgeoisie*, or the hated Bolsheviks, or the offending Jews (as the case may be); for the root-evil is not in the "other" system, the "other" class, the "other" race, but is common to mankind. This is not to say that in its varied manifestations this root-evil may not need to be "reformed" or held in check by the restraints of law; it is to say that these reforms and checks are not, and cannot be, final remedies. They are external to the inner fact. It is fallen human nature itself that is "bourgeois" or "Bolshevik" or whatever may be the relevant term of opprobrium. God alone can bring in the Kingdom of God; the event is His Event—His Advent. The best that human reforms and revolutions can do is to prepare the way for the chariots of the King.

But this faith, in its political application, delivers us from a utopianism that leads nowhere except from an illusory optimism to a paralysing pessimism. The Evangelical is neither an optimist nor a pessimist but a theistic realist who sees within and beyond the tragedy of evil the one only divine Reality. In Berdyaev's words[2]:

> The prophets of Christianity are not optimistic, . . . they condemn with severity the evil from which there is no escape in this world. But neither are they pessimistic, for the fact is that they are far beyond human optimism or human pessimism. They look constantly for the coming of Christ in all His power and glory.

Again, this evangelical emphasis upon the inwardness and universality of the human problem—this insistence that the root-evil exists, and must be dealt with, in Man as Man and not isolatively in any class or race or nation—points to another doctrine of supreme political significance; namely, the solidarity of the human race. The Christian faith is nothing if not international and humanitary in its outlook, albeit its internationalism and humanism are under the discipline of a moral realism: and this must also be fundamental to a true political Liberalism.

For it is plain, at least to every man of liberal mind, that the immediate perils of our time arise from the vogue of either a neutral and supine non-interventionist morality or a specializing cultus that makes isolation a positive virtue and exalts the part above the whole. Marxism concentrates upon the Proletariat, elevates class-consciousness to the level of a religion, and preaches an internationalism which in itself is no more than the cosmopolitanism of a single class. National-Socialism concentrates upon the nation, detaches it from all other nations, and claims for it an exclusive devotion which recognizes no law, no loyalty, no morality that is not derived from the one supreme sovereignty of the Nation-State. Thus its "totalitarianism" is the totality of a fraction: its "total" is simply the sum of national needs, interests, institutions, and aims. The vast remainder

[2] *Freedom and the Spirit*, 361.

of the world that lies outside the frontiers of the elect nation is left out of consideration except as a field for imperial ambition and commercial expansion, or as the territory of rival nations whose evil designs must be watched and countered. Humanity as such is left out of the reckoning. And political Liberalism cannot meet this fanatical idolatry of class and nation with Free Trade utilitarianism or rhetorical platitudes about Peace and the Brotherhood of Man, or with vapid idealizations of humankind. It needs the fire and force of a faith that can take account of the actual human tragedy and can read the solidarity of mankind not only in its common needs but also in its common guilt and (if one may make bold to use the bygone word) depravity.

And such a faith, let it be repeated, must save Liberalism from the evil that always besets the revolutionaries of this world and that makes in the end for reaction and demoralization—the evil, namely, of the false Millennarianism which claims for the new revolutionary programme a virtue and finality that belong only to the Kingdom of God. A Liberalism disciplined to any degree by Evangelicalism would not pretend that its own reformist initiative can deal finally with the ultimate problems of mankind. A world in which the solidarity of the human race should be realized in a World Commonwealth which, in turn, should realize to the full the Wellsian dreams of a planned prosperity developed in collective security and peace—such a world would still be in peril of its life by reason of the inner and destructive forces of spiritual evil.

And so we are thrust back upon the evangelical emphasis on the activity of God as distinct from mere humanistic idealism. Mazzini, who had had his early training in the Calvinistic school of Italian Jansenism, made this emphasis fundamental to his own political Liberalism. Without a theistic faith, he argued, the most idealistic political creed is delivered over to ethical pragmatism and must finally make its surrender to the gods of this world—to Fact and Force. "God and Law are identical terms": "everything is preordained". "If there be no law sacred and inviolable, not created by man, what standard can we find to judge whether an act be just or not? In the name of whom, or what, can we protest against oppression and inequality?" So he strove to teach his Italian working-man. The reply of modern Humanism is to offer, as a working substitute for God, the highest conscience of the race and that cumulative tradition which is the crystallized experience of mankind. But apart from the consideration that this "highest conscience of the race" has been formed not by Humanism but by the influence of those transcendental beliefs which Humanism proposes to ignore, and that "the experience of mankind" includes the experience of those same formative beliefs in a transcendent Reality—apart from this obvious consideration, does not the reply of Humanism commit humanity to a *régime* of

perpetual self-reference which must make for world-insanity? For man is so constituted that when his mind turns in upon itself and recognizes no other and higher standard of reference, then his reason itself suffers perversion: and what is true of man may well be true of Man. And indeed we can see something of this in the present mental effects of an exclusive nationalism which commits the nations concerned to a like self-reference, and leads to that loss of humour and to those characteristics of megalomania, touchiness, suspicion, and hysterical exaltation which are the recognized symptoms of insanity.

It may no doubt be urged that what we have called the moral realism of Evangelicalism, as set forth in its doctrine of Sin, challenges Liberalism at the outset and bleeds it white of its enthusiasm for reform. It certainly does challenge it the moment it puts itself forward as a Gospel—as a Faith in its own right—as the good news of salvation by Progress and Reform—as the oracle of the god Demos. But also it may be thought to do so in the sense that the doctrine of Sin is the negation of the whole democratic idea: for how can a human race, so fallen and sinful that no political or economic panacea can cure it—how can such a race be judged fit for the exercise of self-government? This, however, is obviously a blade that cuts both ways. For how, by the same token, can any autocracy or hierarchy of sinful men be supposed to be fit to govern it? "When I am asked", said Lord John Russell, "if such or such a people is fit to be free, I inquire, Is any man fit to be a despot?" But the evangelical answer is that sinful humanity is still under the charter of God that calls it to the responsible exercise of its moral freedom. The very conception of sin implies freedom and responsibility. The evangelical faith certainly denies the divinity of democracy. The voice of the people is not the voice of God; but neither is it the voice of Satan; it is the voice of imperfect, sinful men who have come short of the glory of God, but with whom the Spirit constantly strives, calling them to repentance and to the righteousness which cometh by faith. And democratic liberty is simply the political reflex of that fundamental moral freedom of man without which neither repentance nor moral life itself is possible.

But more; it by no means follows because the evangelical faith denies that the Millennium can be ushered in by any programme of social and political reform that therefore it holds that, within their own sphere, progress and reform are illusory. According to the Faith, man, set in this world by the will of God, owes a duty to the world which sin cannot abrogate. He is here to till it and cultivate it and exercise dominion over it, and this task demands the co-operation of all the faculties and forces of mankind. Here the work of "progress and reform" is a fundamental duty. Man must "accept" the world and labour for its improvement. What the Faith demands is that this

acceptance should not become a surrender to the world—a "going native", a setting of the flesh above the spirit, a denial of eternity in the name of time, a substitution of the kingdoms of man for the Kingdom of God. For the world passeth away and the glory thereof, and the spirit of man can retain the initiative of true progress and reform only as its acceptance of the world is grounded in this denial of its finality.

Here, indeed, and not in an inactive other-worldliness, lies the force of the evangelical Apocalyptic. For the Last Things are not necessarily the Next Things. For us to be sure that our house is to be demolished the day after to-morrow means that we shall not feel obliged to spend time and pains upon keeping it in repair. But to be sure that our house will sometime be demolished, but that nevertheless it may yet endure to be the home of our children and our children's children, means that we cannot put off our responsibility—not only for preserving it but also for improving it. And so with this God-given world. We have an imperative duty to keep it in repair and improve it wherever improvement is possible; not because we have romantic illusions about transforming it into an everlasting palace of enchantment—not because we cannot look beyond it and beyond the term of its duration—but because, knowing its uses as a pilgrim-hostel and schoolhouse of humanity, we see its value in the light of eternity.

It is in this sober and chastened mood which an evangelical realism evokes that we can contemplate the function and force of political Liberalism. Standing for liberty, not as opposed to law but as opposed to unconsenting servitude, it witnesses to the divine order in the world. For this world of fallen men is none the less a world of men and not of apes or Peri or Robots; and Liberalism stands for that essential freedom without which this present life cannot be moralized or humanized at all but can only be demoralized and dehumanized. It seems to be only through Liberalism that the doctrine of Man as a free and responsible spirit can be translated into politics to-day, and that the constitution of Humanity as a moral and therefore a voluntary fellowship of covenanted peoples can ever be actualized. The principle is not regenerative; it is Law and not Gospel; but without it no Gospel is possible and no Kingdom of God conceivable.

But here, as Liberals (one uses the word in its political but not its Party significance), and within the world-outlook of the Evangelical faith, we can find a place for all our dreams of "progress and reform". International democracy, "collective security", a world commonwealth, the banishment of war and of poverty, the removal of all artificial and arbitrary barriers of class and caste, the development of a common law, a common polity, a common exploration and administration of the resources of the earth—there is nothing

that is too good to be hoped for and striven for, if only it is conceived and shapen in the realism of faith and not in the illusion of mere man-worship. And beside these dreams how shall we set our present sterile and sickly policies of opportunist neutrality and non-intervention?

Only—let us repeat it—after all these dreams have come to pass and all these reforms have been achieved the warfare of the Faith will be only beginning. For, as M. Julien Benda has argued in his *Great Betrayal,* it is always possible to make of all these achievements the expression of the egoism and imperialism of the human species:

> Thereafter humanity would be unified in . . . one immense factory, would be aware only of heroisms, disciplines, inventions . . . would long cease to situate the good outside the real [physical] world, would have no God but itself and its desires, and would achieve great things, by which I mean that it would attain to a really grandiose control over the matter surrounding it, to a really joyous consciousness of its power and glory. And History will smile to think that this is the species for which Socrates and Jesus Christ died.

Here, in the fact that there are secret and subtle forces of the human spirit that can pervert the most grandiose material achievements of civilization, we are brought to the limits of all external reform. In perpetual peace we might grow supine, in prosperity soft, in security indolent, and our earthly paradise might be corrupted into a lavish and luxurious hell. Whether or not it would be so depends upon no system of outward regulations and appointments but upon something inward and intangible—upon the quality and direction of the human spirit itself. And this depends at last upon man's relation, not indeed to religion, but to original and ultimate Reality, to the Eternal Spirit that indwells and transcends all things.

THE DIVINE INITIATIVE.

By W. B. Selbie, M.A., D.D.

The Word of God is itself the act of God.
The Word of God in the highest sense makes history.
Karl Barth.

We are accustomed to speak of man's approach to God. Is there such a thing as God's approach to man? It is commonly said in these days that there is not. Men complain that God does nothing, or at least that they can find in the world as they know it no evidence that He either says or does anything. They admit that religion may have its uses. As an escape or a wish fulfilment or an incentive to action it may stir in some people feelings which make for fuller life. But it is all a matter of internal experience to which there is no response of an objective kind. Therefore religion must be without revelation, a purely humanist discipline, a Positivism in which mankind is its own God. There are many in this generation who, like the Jews of old, seek after a sign and are utterly blind to the signs given them. They think that God must be altogether such an one as themselves. Because He does not send an advertizing aeroplane to write His name in the heavens they conclude that He is a God that hideth Himself, and therefore that He is no concern of theirs. There are many, too, who, though they may not deny God's existence and activity, yet find very great difficulty in reconciling the thought of God with the course of the world as they know it. If there be a God and if He has made Himself known to men, then it seems very strange that He should have done it all so inadequately. Men are still left to feel after Him, if haply they may find Him, and the evidences of His presence, care, and goodness seem few and far between. Hence the renewed interest in these days in the problem of revelation as a practical proposition. It is not so much a matter of epistemology as of life. If God has really spoken and still speaks, then how, when, and where can we hear Him? What has He to say and what does He expect of us in response to His word? Karl Barth and his followers have obeyed a true impulse in laying paramount stress on the givenness of God and on the objectivity and finality of His word. This crisis-theology is their answer to a one-sided subjectivism, and a timely corrective of it. Our concern, they say, is not with man's thought of God but with God's thought of man, with that direct Word of God which is the primal and constitutive element in all theology and in all religion. But like all reactions the crisis-theology goes too far. As has often been pointed out, its great defect is in its doctrine of man. The Barthians rule out all mysticism and all religion of experience because man's reason is so darkened and perverted by sin

that he is incapable by himself, not merely of comprehending, but even of apprehending, God. There is thus no way from man to God. Between the two a great gulf is fixed and the bridge over it is only secured on one side. At the root of this theology there is an unresolved dualism arising out of its failure to recognize that a spoken word needs to be heard if it is to count for anything. Man, therefore, must be *capax dei* at least in the sense that he is able to hear the Divine Word and so to have an apprehension of God however little he may comprehend Him. This human idea of revelation we shall deal with later on. For the moment we are only concerned to point out that even so purely objective a theology as that of Barth cannot ignore the importance of the human and subjective element. There is good evidence of this in the stress which Barthians, following Luther, lay on faith alone as the groundwork of religion. They seem quite to overlook the fact that faith, as they interpret it, is only another form of experience. They cannot rule out the human equation, though Brunner does argue that "Revelation creates faith not faith revelation".

But the Barthians have done good service in calling attention once more, and in very pertinent fashion, to the importance of the objective in theology, of the divine initiative, of revelation. We are justified in believing that God hath never left Himself without witness, and we have as good ground for accepting the reality of that which is given in religious experience as we have for accepting the reality of the outside world. But we are concerned now with the further question as to the content of that experience. Granted that there is a revelation behind the experience, what forms does it take and what kind of a God does it reveal? We know that men tend to make gods in their own image, and we know also that God often seems to repudiate the image they make of Him. The history of religion abounds in instances where men have accepted as the will of God ideas and actions altogether contrary to their own desires and hopes. The way of progress in religion is marked by the abandonment of cherished ideas in favour of new and strange ones which, however distasteful they have been, men have regarded as representing the mind of God.

This raises the much discussed question of the relation between revelation and discovery. Is religion the product of culture and education, the natural outcome of man's expanding knowledge and wider acquaintance with the world he lives in, or is it something given, a personal communication to persons? Some, no doubt, would argue with Dr. Goudge that in religion "no valid distinction can be drawn between discovery and revelation". Others would maintain that while every revelation is a discovery in the sense of opening up new truth, every discovery is not a revelation. There is always room for patient research and inquiry in religion as in every other department of human knowledge. Indeed there must be such inquiry if

religion is to retain its hold of the mind. And it is quite open to a man to say when his investigation has thrown new light on a subject, "It was a revelation to me". But this is a loose use of language. Revelation properly speaking implies the impartation of knowledge such as would not normally be acquired by ordinary methods of research and reasoning. There comes a point when, "having tried all other ways", men feel themselves driven "to try just God's", and to say, "I will hear what God the Lord will speak". No doubt the capacity to hear the Word of the Lord can be and needs to be strengthened and educated. But that does not mean that the full truth of God can be attained by human effort without any action on God's part. Men are like buried miners burrowing their way to light and safety, but never likely to reach it unless help is forthcoming from the other side. It is true that all revelation is mediated and therefore conditioned by the character of the medium on the one hand and man's capacity to use it aright on the other. But this, again, does not exclude the direct action of God. So we may conclude with Prof. Farmer that

> pre-eminently the word revelation, even in popular speech, is appropriate to a two term personal relationship where one actively imparts to another through a medium of communication, through speech: pre-eminently the word discovery is appropriate to our dealing with impersonal objects which do not in that sense actively convey themselves to us at all[1].

Another vexed question is whether revelation is and can be progressive. It is argued, for example, that revelation being from God it must be perfect and final at any point. But this is to make it static rather than dynamic, and to overlook the fact that it is dependent on man's capacity to receive it and may itself be one of the means by which that capacity is increased; as when Jesus said to His disciples, "I have many things to say unto you but ye cannot bear them now". We should not be far wrong if we translated that into a word of God spoken to mankind all through the ages. But such a belief in the continued revelation of God does not involve a uniform and inherent progress. We can no longer set aside religions outside Christianity as works of the Devil or products of man's perverted reason. We believe that God has spoken in them "in divers portions and in divers manners". But He has not always been clearly heard and His message has been sadly distorted by the passions and perversity of men. If there has been development in religion at all, it has followed a very devious course and is only discernible to one who stands apart and takes a wide view over the landscape as a whole. Such development, too, has been spasmodic rather than orderly. It has been marked by the rise of great religious leaders who have had a word of God to reveal. They were often stoned or crucified, yet their word

[1] *The World and God*, 79.

remained, adding one more brick to the temple of God. So in all religions there have been times of decay and revival, of corruption and renewal, and only the fittest have survived. We can see animism giving place to polytheism, polytheism to monolatry, and monolatry to monotheism. We can see idolatries fading away before a more ethical conception of God, and the grosser forms of symbolism, sacrifice, and cultus yielding to the more spiritual. The student of the history of religion cannot fail to note how many of the lower forms of religion become schoolmasters to lead men higher. But he realizes also that this is not so much due to anything necessarily and inherently progressive in religion itself as to the action of God revealing Himself here a little and there a little to men as they were able to bear it and so leading them on to yet more light and truth. The end is not yet. Even what we regard as the final and perfect revelation in Jesus Christ has been so distorted and misinterpreted by men that its full radiance is still concealed. But it remains a word of the Lord to those who have ears to hear. There is a revelation of God here, and the need is now—as it has always been—to open the eyes of the blind and to unstop the ears of the deaf that they may see the vision and hear the voice of God.

Of the specific forms under which men have conceived of God as revealing Himself, that through Nature is probably the earliest and most widespread. Here the touch of nature does indeed make the whole world kin. The heavens declare the glory of God to the frightened savage as to the psalmist or the modern poet. Our familiar harvest festivals recall the autumn Saturnalia of many religions all over the world. That God may be seen in His works and worshipped for His bounty is a common and natural frame of mind. Men found God in the great powers of Nature, in storm and flood and earthquake, as well as in her more beneficent gifts of rain and sunshine. So we have purely nature religions of a gross and unspiritual kind marked by fertility rites and orgies of sacrificial feasting, satisfying to man's bodily needs but starvation to his soul. At best they represent but a low stage in religious development. Side by side with them is the conception common to many religions of God as the Lord of Nature and as revealing Himself in it. The Hebrew psalms are full of praise for the wonder of God's mighty works in creation and the story of His power in the world of Nature. They are echoed in writings like *Job* and find a fit modern setting in the poetry of Wordsworth. To many people in these days all talk about God in Nature may be good poetry, but it is very difficult to turn it into hard prose. Chemistry, meteorology, and astronomy have so altered our view of the natural world as to make it hard to realize that God plays any part in it. Prayers for rain or fine weather are at a discount, and in an epidemic most people would trust to inoculations and disinfectants rather than to prayer. But this modern attitude of

semi-scepticism points to some real confusion of thought. We may accept all that science can teach us about the working of the universe without in any sense thrusting God out of the picture. Indeed the more we know of the wonder of His ways the greater should be our reverence for His power and goodness. Unless we are prepared to believe with the humanists that the Universe is that extraordinary miracle a self-creating and self-adjusting machine, we shall forget the mechanism in the marvel of the mind that conceived it. No explanation of the natural processes involved can ever destroy our appreciation of the beauty of the natural world, a landscape or a sunset or the sky at night. Religion, like art, rests on a qualitative interpretation of the world and of life. The power to estimate quality, whether æsthetic or moral, constitutes a link between the mind of man and the reality behind creation. However much tastes may differ, and however varied may be our standards, the sense of beauty remains something integral to our consciousness and eloquent of a deeper meaning in things than appears on the surface. So a beautiful picture or statue is more than a representation of certain objects. It can and should convey to our minds the thought and ideals not merely of the artist but of a whole people, just as the sculpture of Pheidias embodied the glory that was Greece. Humanists may content themselves with a purely utilitarian account of the sense of beauty as "the spontaneous human escape and consolation in a trying and difficult world", but this only represents one side of the picture. Much more to the point is the parallel between mysticism and æsthetics drawn by Prof. W. E. Hocking in his *Types of Philosophy*:

> The mystic's experience of the Real is closely allied to the perception of beauty in nature. Perhaps the simplest and most widespread form of the mystic experience is that which finds in these occasional glimpses of beauty something more than an interesting play of form and the superficial qualities of things, namely, an indication that there is within Nature a reality akin to ourselves and as it were an invitation to our union with that inner reality.

The old Nature-religions perished because they rested on the contradiction between the Natural and the Spiritual. When we resolve that contradiction by interpreting Nature as the realm of a God who is immanent within it, we come much nearer the truth. The capacity of man to interpret Nature qualitatively and so to see God in it and through it to think His thoughts after Him, is good evidence that we are here in touch with a reality which is at least congruous with our experience.

We have seen how all revelation of God is mediated and often distorted by the medium. This is especially the case when the medium is a great personality. God made man in His own image and it is therefore natural and right that God's Word to man should

often come through man. The part played in the religious development of the race by prophets can therefore hardly be exaggerated. Yet prophetic religion, so-called, remains a phenomenon by itself and cannot be explained or accounted for as the product of a normal process of religious development. This does not mean that prophets can be cut off from history. They come in the fullness of the time; they belong to their age and they speak its language. But they are not made by the circumstances that call them forth. They seek rather to rule and shape events by the new standards and ideals which they have received. They are conscious always, and this is the hallmark of their calling, that they have heard the Word of God and that they must pass it on to others. And the Word is like a fire in their bones, they are men under authority, driven by a force they cannot resist. Often the Word that comes to them is unpalatable, obscure, even dangerous, but they know it to be a Word of God. They are acutely conscious of their shortcomings as God's mouthpieces. Jeremiah's plaint, "Ah, Lord God! behold, I cannot speak for I am a child", finds an echo in the breast of every prophet worth the name. The power of God's word is never more apparent than in the faith and courage of the men who could say "Thus saith the Lord" without fear or favour, and often to their own undoing. In the Old Testament alone the polemic of the prophets first against false gods and then against idols, along with their insistence on the moralization of religion and their preference of mercy before sacrifice, strikes a note which in their day was new, strange and unpopular. There is no swimming with the stream here, no tickling of the ears of men with the kind of message they love to hear. The prophet is not concerned just to tell men of his own opinions and ideas. He has heard the voice of God like the roaring of a lion and it has startled him into utterance which is strange even to his own ears. The one sure thing is that "the Lord God hath spoken". The prophetic spirit is animated throughout by the consciousness that God is working and speaking not only in the experience of individuals, but in the life of nations and in the history of the world. Yahweh, for example, is concerned with the actions and policy of Tyre and Sidon and the rest as well as with those of his own people. He can even make Cyrus his messenger and can cause the wrath of men to praise him. There is more in this than simply the natural tendency to interpret current events in terms of a providential order. The prophets' belief in Providence is real enough. But they are more concerned with judgment than with beneficence. Without being pessimists they realize that God's judgments are abroad in the earth as the result of man's failure to hear and obey God's word. Their mission is to warn men of their peril and at the same time to deliver God's word to them afresh and to remind them of what it is that He requires at their hands. And the God in whose name they speak is

one who has spontaneously made Himself known to them and of whose truth, justice, and loving-kindness they can speak at first hand. Some of the greatest of the prophets are both practical men and mystics, statesmen and reformers as well as seers and visionaries. Their actions are all the time dictated and dominated by the sense that they are instruments in God's hands as well as the mouthpieces of His will. Their communion with God is no mere idle exercise. It blossoms forth in inspired activity.

> They ply their daily task with busier feet
> Because their secret souls a heavenly strain repeat.

In Söderblom's words[2]:

> It is not our ignorance nor the obscurity of the problem which marks the divine in the work of the prophets. It is not the difficulty and darkness which surround the origin of the prophetic religion which is the determining element. Rather it is the clear insight that a new stream of profound religious content, which itself points to an immediate contact with God as its source, has come into the world through the prophets.

What is true of the prophets of Israel is in a measure true also of many other great religious teachers and leaders. Both within Christianity and outside it there have been those who in spite of much error and corruption have shown in their lives and teaching clear evidence of the leading and illumination of the spirit of God. As an old writer said, "God suffered all the nations to walk in their own ways and yet He left Himself not without witness". The whole history of religion affords a striking illustration of the parable of the tares and wheat. There good and evil, light and darkness, are strangely intermingled, and it is only after a long interval that the harvest comes and makes judgment possible. The test of the fruits makes it at least reasonable to conclude that the hand of God has been at work. As we have seen, there is no such thing as uniform religious progress. It is always a case of ebb and flow, of action and reaction. Advance is often sudden and spontaneous, due to the emergence of men of spiritual insight and genius, only to be followed by a period of decline and decadence. Such men themselves have always been conscious that they were instruments in the hands of God and the mouthpiece of His word. History, too, would seem to show that, judged by the fruits, they were not mistaken. Their own humble and awe-stricken consciousness of being messengers of God counts for something, especially when enhanced and confirmed by the new light and truth which they have mediated to men. They and their work are known by the fruits, and when all allowance has been made for the influence of environment and the operation of their native genius, the conviction remains with themselves as with others that belief in the special activity of God in and through the lives of

[2] *The Nature of Revelation*, 34.

spiritual men is more than justified. As W. P. Paterson says[3]:

> The chief reason for the inexpugnable conviction of the reality of divine influence is that the human spirit is so constituted that the presence and the power of God strike chords in the soul other than those which make response to objects and events of the natural world—that it knows the divine when it meets it, and recognizes in the experiences of illumination and sanctification the hall mark of the Divine handiwork.

If we are right in assuming that God is personal, and that an essential element in personality is capacity to enter into relations with other personalities, then we can easily understand how revelation at its highest will always be personal. God is undoubtedly made known in Nature and through history. But Nature-religions easily tend to pantheism, and the God of history is often known as a force rather than a person. But in all personal relations there is something sacrificial, and it stands to reason, therefore, that revelation will depend upon man's response to God quite as much as upon God's speech to man. This becomes very obvious when we consider the culmination of the revelation process in Jesus Christ in whom the Word became flesh. Here God speaks finally and most effectively in a human person, and it seems inevitable that His Word should ultimately take this form. The story of Jesus in the Gospels reveals a personality of transcendent strength, tenderness, and beauty, and it is therein that His attraction lies. Men feel that they have in Him not merely a champion but a friend. Men feel that they can enter into living communion with Him and maintain an intimate personal contact such as means new life to their souls. But this has not always been so. From the days of His flesh Jesus Christ has repelled as well as attracted. It is written,

> He came unto His own and His own received Him not . . . The light shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehended it not.

His coming was a reality, an acted word of God to men. But men failed to hear it aright and have miserably distorted it and misrepresented it ever since. Jesus Himself anticipated this when He bade men so insistently "Take heed how ye hear". The good seed of the Word is useless unless it falls on good ground. What man does with God's revelation is the point that really matters. It may well be that one of the objects of Christ's coming into the world was to prepare the hearts of men to receive that fuller revelation of God of which He was Himself the embodiment. He is the way to the Father as well as the truth and the life. But it has proved a long way and a narrow and difficult one, from which it is easy to go astray. The history of Christian thought or doctrine shows clearly enough man's unreadiness or even incapacity to receive the full light

[3] *The Nature of Religion*, 144.

of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Speculation about His person and discussion about His work have interested men more than efforts to do His will. And they have been shaped and directed in accordance with current philosophies or fashions of thought rather than with a single eye to the truth. The Church has always found it so much easier to insist on orthodox opinions about Jesus Christ than on the obligation to follow His example and think His thoughts after Him. The mind of man has proved a very distorting medium when confronted with "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ". Nevertheless the strength of Christianity lies in the fact that it is truth embodied not merely in a tale but in a Person. God was in Christ as He was not in any other prophet, priest, or king. His perfect humanity became the one fit vehicle for communicating the way and will of God to men. There is no question here of the medium distorting the word or blurring the image. Men see God in Him and enter into personal relations with God through Him because He is Himself "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person".

But here, again, the human equation must be reckoned with. In his admirable little book, *The Nature of Revelation*, Söderblom says a great deal about what he calls the portals of revelation, that is, about the human side of the subject. What is it in man that enables him to communicate with the unseen and spiritual world and assures him of its reality? He points to certain doors or windows in the human personality through which light from the beyond can enter in:

> The portals for revelation in the human personality are three, the intellect or understanding, the intuition of infinity with its emphasis on feeling, and the urge of the ideal or conscience[4].

These are all of equal importance, but each has its work to do in bringing men into living touch with a living God. Here we are on familiar ground. Söderblom, however, argues that the part which the intellect plays in religion is not that of a discoverer, but of a critic. It is not a source of knowledge, but controls, tests, and discriminates. It is thus a safeguard against superstition and the blind acceptance of traditional ideas. It enables us to try the spirits whether they be of God. So, as there is a conative element in all knowledge, we may conclude that reason in religion works by faith.

> An element of value is found in all knowledge and the object of faith possesses objectivity in fully as great a degree as does that of knowledge based on the sense perceptions. If the comparison is to be made it can be said that faith possesses a more certain assurance of its object than does other knowledge[5].

Revelation, then, is to faith, and can only be grasped by faith. The channels through which revelation comes to meet man's faith are

[4] P. 109. [5] *Op. cit.*, 115.

twofold, "the consciousness of infinity", and "the urge to the ideal". These are in some degree shared by all mankind, and the human apprehension of the divine is conditioned and regulated by the extent to which they are developed and used. The union of the mystical and the moral in man is an open door to religious certitude. They are distinct, and yet their co-operation is necessary if religion is not to evaporate in mere sentiment. The longing for communion with God and the passion for righteousness together prepare the spirit of man for receiving a revelation which is at once vision and action. Söderblom sums up the whole position as follows[6]:

> We must consequently posit as the subject of faith, not the understanding, the human organ of knowledge only, but the whole spiritual being of man which Pascal calls the heart. And if we wish to define more closely the powers of soul, the gifts or drives in man which set faith in motion to seek God, we must necessarily come to consciousness of the infinite which we possess, consciousness of the spiritual reality, which is beyond, which does not permit itself to be enclosed within measurable limits. And as another generating impulse to faith we note the longing of man for perfection, his sense of lack and of sin and guilt and his striving to attain to realization of the ideal. Revelation, that is to say, God and His words, cannot be grasped by man otherwise than by faith. Faith cannot be satisfied with anything less than God Himself as He has revealed Himself.

Now all this is a very sound and acute defence of the objective reality of religion, and it carries its moral with it. Revelation is a reality. God does speak to man. But man has to hear the word and receive it. His capacity to do this is native to him and by itself is good evidence of the fact that there is a word to be heard and received. But this capacity, this religious sense, like all other human faculties, may be atrophied or even destroyed. It must be used or it will cease to function. It is in vain that we speak to the deaf or hold up a vision before the eyes of the blind. The problem of revelation to-day is not so much as to its content but as to how to keep open the channels through which it comes. If these are choked, it is no wonder that the word of the Lord is rare and there is no open vision.

First, then, in regard to the reason, it is above all things necessary that in matters of religion men should aim at clarity of thought and absolute sincerity. The search for truth must be fearlessly pursued or He who is the truth will remain for ever hidden from our eyes. It is a thousand pities that terms like rationalism and free-thought should have become the watchwords of the enemies of religion. Every truly religious man should be both a free-thinker and a rationalist in the best sense of these terms. He must be free to exercise his reason in religion as in everything else, for it is a God-given

[6] P. 117.

power which he dare not suffer to rust through disuse. He will do this best by exercising his powers of criticism and discrimination. It may be true that no man can by searching, that is, by his unaided reason, find out God. But he can by rational process verify, correct, or refute what men have said about God or what purports to be His Word. The history of religious thought shows clearly enough that nothing so surely leads to spiritual stagnation as the blind and uncritical acceptance of religious doctrines which for the time are held to be authoritative and orthodox. The distrust of intellectualism and the tendency to swear into the words of a Church whether credible or not which are so widespread to-day are the surest signs of religious decline and unrest. There is always danger in identifying the word of God with the *ipse dixit* of a Church, or a Council, or even an inspired individual. These may be true so far as they go, but to accept them on authority is to run the risk of closing the mind to larger issues and wider horizons. It is easy to pay lip service to the belief that God has always more light and truth to break forth from His Word. But it is a different matter and not so easy to be ready to discover and accept the more light and truth when it appears, especially if it conflicts with truth hitherto revealed and held to be precious. Yet it stands to reason that only by such open-mindedness can the cause of religious truth ever be advanced. To refuse to accept beliefs on hearsay or at second hand, to exercise the right to try the spirits, and to put ideas to the test of experiment, is not idle scepticism, but the best way of paying homage to the truth. The Word of God often comes to men with the most startling assurance when they have cleared the ground of their minds from the lumber of outworn ideas. Sincerity, simplicity, and a single eye to the truth are the conditions on man's side which make revelation a reality. The intellectual effort involved in the search after God is therefore not altogether in vain. However fruitless it seems, and however grim the difficulties it raises, the search itself is its own reward. For it prepares the seeker, the whole man and not merely his mind, to receive and appreciate the response which God makes. He is found of those who truly seek Him.

So God is revealed also in that mystical consciousness of infinity which is especially strong in certain natures, though all men may possess it in a measure. Man's religious consciousness has to do with normal experiences of his every-day life. That is true of the average, but does not exclude the possibility of abnormal experiences by which some men feel themselves brought into closer and more immediate touch with God than they could otherwise attain. These experiences include visions, ecstasies, auditions, and the like, such as are generally classed under the term mystical. They carry with them an assurance of the reality of God and of the spiritual world which is convincing to those who are subject to them, though less so to the matter of fact

observer outside. They must be tested by their fruits, and at their best add to the weight of the evidence for determining the reality of the unseen and eternal. They are undoubtedly characteristic of certain temperaments and point to certain psycho-physical conditions. But that is not to suggest that they are diseased or psychopathic, or, if they are that, not worthy of serious attention. As William James has pointed out in a famous passage[7]:

> In the psycho-pathic temperament we have the emotionalism which is the *sine qua non* of moral perception; we have the intensity and tendency to emphasize which are the essence of practical moral vigour; and we have the love of metaphysics and mysticism which carry one's interests beyond the surface of the sensible world. What, then, is more natural than that this temperament should introduce one to regions of religious truth, to corners of the Universe which your robust Philistine type of nervous system, for ever offering its biceps to be felt, thumping its breast and thanking heaven that it has not a single morbid fibre in its constitution, would be sure to hide for ever from its self-satisfied possessors. If there were such a thing as inspiration from a higher realm, it might well be that the neurotic temperament would furnish the chief condition of the requisite receptivity.

The mystics themselves seem to be quite clear that their special experiences are not ends in themselves and must be judged by their spiritual results. For example, St. John of the Cross in his *Ascent of Mount Carmel* declares,

> All visions, revelations, and heavenly feelings, and whatever is greater than these, are worth the least act of humility bearing the fruits of that charity which neither values nor seeks itself, which thinketh well not of self but of others.

Mysticism whether of the more intense or milder type is indeed an avenue to the presence of God which can neither be despised nor ignored. But it must justify itself at the bar of reason and show the fruits of the spirit. For the average man its value lies in its witness to a depth of spiritual experience and to an intimacy of communion with God which he cannot attain himself, but which greatly enhances his assurance of the reality of things unseen. This assurance is increased when mysticism finds its perfect work in lives of devotion to the service of God and man.

Finally, we have another channel of revelation in man's moral sense, conscience, or urge to the ideal. Kant's reverence for the moral law above was really reverence for the lawgiver. But we have now got beyond the conception of morality as a fixed code, the work of a legislator. The law is within rather than above us. The conscience of Socrates suggested to him his *daimon,* and Puritans generally can interpret their sense of duty as the stern daughter of

[7] *The Varieties of Religious Experience,* 24.

the voice of God. That is natural and legitimate enough. God does speak to men in conscience, and the sense of right and wrong does point to a pattern laid up in heaven. But here as in so many other religious matters we have to lay down a rule *solvitur ambulando*. It is not merely by recognizing the will of God, but by doing it that we become assured of His presence and power. According to one of the most profound sayings in the Gospels, it is by willing to do the will of God that men enter into His secret. As we have seen already, obedience is the organ of spiritual knowledge. And the pith of the so-called moral argument lies not in the fact that a law points to a lawgiver, but in the much more relevant and interesting consideration that the effort to do God's will creates in man that kind of affinity or *rapport* with God that makes Him intensely real. Here, again, the average man will often be at a loss to know what the will of God is and to choose between the various interpretations of it. But the crucial matter here is not so much the nature of the will of God as the man's determination to do it. He that willeth to do. A man may well be mistaken as to what is the will of God for him at any given moment of his life, but if he is governed always by the passionate determination to do God's will so far as he knows it, that is all he needs. One thing is quite certain, namely, that the more he tries to do God's will the deeper will be his insight into the nature of that will. Carlyle's axiom holds good here, "Do the duty that lies nearest and the next one will become clearer". But, more than that, if the duty is conceived of and done as the will of God, something of God Himself is disclosed in it. It is the saint who is the expert in religion. Men whose lives are consecrated to God's service and whose continual prayer is "Thy will be done" have that experimental knowledge of God and of His ways that makes His presence real and His help available.

HAZLITT REVISITED.

By W. R. Niblett, B.A., B.Litt.

Few literary critics of merit were at work in England between 1780 and 1800 in spite of the growing sales of psuedo-critical periodicals. The criticism typical of the eighteenth century, written from a point of view no longer acceptable and directed to a far different audience, had for some time been obsolescent. "Up to the year 1802", writes Gillies,

> what pitiful abortions were our so-styled reviews! The object of their authors was to give an account of the books, and the notion that upon every occasion there should be a special drift to contend for, an opportunity caught and improved for benefiting the cause of literature, or politics, or morals, or science, by placing the subject in a new light, seemed never once to have entered into the calculations of our self-complacent critics.

Yet there was danger in such improvement of opportunity. The *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly* undoubtedly stimulated the interest taken by many in literature during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, but the defect of these cleverly-written magazines lay in their attempt to do the reader's thinking for him. They wished him not merely to accept the arbitrary selection of books chosen for review but to consent to the authority they set over his opinions. The *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly* tried to convert interest rather than to stimulate free thought. Having comparatively little concern with a book for its own sake their reviewers had already made the tenets of a certain group of opinion into dogmas for whose proclamation books were often but a formal and introductory apology; and as teachers of literary taste they were consequently imperfect.

It thus came about that a large portion of the task of educating the best literary taste during the years succeeding 1800 was left to free-lance critics—and among these was Hazlitt. Before he could start to write literary criticism, however, he had himself to be educated.

Very early in his son's life Hazlitt's father, a Unitarian minister, staunch and vital and independent of mind, encouraged the lad to think for himself and stay loyal to whatever convictions he came to feel right. By 1790 at the age of twelve Hazlitt was already reading Priestley, one of the most vigorous and progressive minds of his time—a very "Voltaire of the Unitarians"[1]—and by 1791 defending him in a letter to the *Shrewsbury Chronicle* as "one of the best, one of the wisest, and one of the greatest of men". Hazlitt as a boy showed that eagerness to seek impressions even at high cost, that

[1] Hazlitt's *Works*, xii. 358.

intense interest in his own experiences, and that courage to face facts as they presented themselves, which were to distinguish him later as a literary critic. At the age of fifteen, when he was sent to Hackney Unitarian College, he was already alert to contemporary affairs, and thoughtful concerning political theory; he had read, together with books of theology, much of the work of Steele, Addison, Fielding, Richardson, Smollett, Cervantes, and Le Sage. Hackney College (founded 1787) was not organized solely for the training of candidates for the Unitarian ministry: indeed in 1790, three years before the commencement of Hazlitt's residence, of its forty-nine students only nineteen were candidates for ordination[2]. The importance of Hazlitt's two years at this place is very great; when he went down he had already come under most of the vital influences of the new age. We may assume that in September 1793 he came under the direct influence of Joseph Priestley[3], who in that month began to deliver the series of lectures terminated only by his enforced departure for America in April 1794. Priestley was an ardent disciple of Hartley, devoted to the cause of knowledge, and one who himself approved the French Revolution. Hazlitt's life between 1793 and 1795 contained much hard thinking; he was engaged in journeying back to experience and discovering what he felt to be, as distinct from what he had been told was, the truth. First of all, he was reading Hartley for himself. Hartley's theory implies a close appeal to psychology; and honest non-acceptance of its dictates, such as was Hazlitt's, implies an extremely high degree of self-knowledge. Hazlitt's mind at Hackney came deeply to question its own beliefs, trying to analyze the reasons for them. Always an enthusiast, Hazlitt was finding in the nature of his own mind the latest subject for enthusiasm. He felt himself instinctively rebelling against the Hartleian analysis of the human mind, and his task became that of seeking reasons to justify his instincts. This growth in Hazlitt of the tendency to introspect is significant to his later criticism. "I did arrive", he tells us, "at some very satisfactory and potent conclusions".

When in 1795 Hazlitt left Hackney he did not leave behind the impulse "to think with his time" which it had so powerfully encouraged. He continued his reading of the French Encyclopedists and of Rousseau their assailant—authors whose ideas were formative to typically romantic ways of thought, deep study of whom led inevitably to consideration of very fundamental problems. The standards to which Hazlitt's literary criticism eventually appealed

2 For Hazlitt's connections with Hackney College, see *Transactions* of Unitarian Hist. Soc., IV, 219-247. The students were apparently encouraged to widen their interests to include political issues of the day; as a whole they were keen supporters of the French Revolution.

3 *Cf.* Hazlitt's essay on "The late Dr. Priestley", *Works*, XII, 357 ff. He probably went with the other students to hear Priestley's sermons at the Unitarian Chapel at Hackney.

were those of a vital tradition which during his early years was developing so rapidly that much active thought was necessary to keep pace with it. Jeffrey and the *Reviews* dropped behind; Coleridge and Hazlitt found it necessary to become philosophers if they were to be literary critics of the kind their own natures and the nature of their time needed them to be.

In Rousseau Hazlitt found not merely an inspirer but a kindred spirit and a hero such as was necessary at this time to the growth of his own mind. "Rousseau", he says, "was the first who held the torch (lighted at the never-dying fire in his own bosom) to the hidden chambers of the mind of man . . . ".

The period of Hazlitt's education is marked after 1796 by two chief occurrences—one the meeting with Coleridge in 1798 and the other the publication of the *Principles of Human Action* in 1805. When Hazlitt first met Coleridge, the latter was still at a period prior to that of the influence of German idealism upon him, and the two men consequently both in interests and in potentialities had much in common. Like Hazlitt, Coleridge had already studied Hume and Hartley, and had reacted strongly against the notion that the human mind is a mechanism. Hazlitt perhaps caught more than he ever learned from this man—who regulated his creeds by his conceptions and not by sight. For in Coleridge he saw himself as more than he appeared and yet not more than he secretly knew himself to be. Poetry and philosophy had met together; Hazlitt became conscious that he too was a man of his own age; that he too must develop powers of expression.

It was not, however, for six years after the original meeting with Coleridge that Hazlitt completed a written justification for having "wasted" so many of his early years in thinking upon life in general. *The Principles of Human Action, an Argument in defence of the Natural Disinterestedness of the Human Mind* is a document most valuable in affording us a glimpse of his own mind as it was in 1805. His fine and sensitive intelligence, his zest to experience, his humanity, and ability to recognize it, his power of logic and critical promise all lie open to discernment. "To have", as he later says, "a disinterested regard to truth, the mind must have contemplated it in abstract and remote questions". Here, before he turns literary critic, he proves his achievement of a philosophy, one which when he is writing literary criticism remains implicit not superseded. *The Principles of Human Action* could have been written only by a man with a critical mind—one determined to dominate his environment and make it into the stuff of thought. In this treatise the feelings of ten years are rationalized, the rationalizations posited as dogmas of an achieved faith.

The body of Hazlitt's criticism forms the first important survey of English literature after Johnson's *Lives*, which had excepted from

review authors who were not poets, and, among the poets themselves, Chaucer, Spenser and Shakespeare. Between 1817 and his death in 1830, Hazlitt critically considered the whole range of English literature, while of foreign authors he knew, among many others, Rabelais, Boccaccio and Cervantes, Dante, Ariosto and Tasso, Molière, Racine and Le Sage, Plato and Cicero, Goethe and Schiller. He found in his reading an occupation which enabled him to express many feelings in addition to those he could make into abstract thought. For in reading books and in writing about them he could be freely himself; and his criticism thus, since he was so truly a man of his age, came to be an examination of literature as it could naturally be seen from the point of view of its own time and the "new and unusual aspect" typical of it. Spontaneous, enthusiastic, intuitive, humane, Hazlitt's critical essays are at once a defence of his own opinions and also, because philosophic in many of their interests, a vindication of their own attitude to life.

The form of much of Hazlitt's criticism is determined by the fact that he first delivered it verbally. The titles of the most important of his lectures are a guide to the main contributions he made to the literary taste of his time. Men were ready for reconsidering the Elizabethans. Since the decline in popularity of the "German drama" in England, native dramatists had turned to a study of Shakespeare and his contemporaries in order both to gain inspiration and to acquire technical knowledge; Hazlitt, like Coleridge, treats Shakespeare as a skilful dramatist as well as a great dramatic poet. Men were ready also for a re-examination such as Hazlitt's of the works of the eighteenth century writers; and the interest which more thoughtful readers took in their own contemporaries and in poetic theory is to be deduced from the Table of Contents of almost any issue of the *Edinburgh* or *Blackwood's* as well as from portions of Hazlitt's criticism. It was the most vital and unsettled problems of the criticism of his day upon which Hazlitt seized for treatment. Both the defects and virtues of his critical work arise from this fact.

There are two ways in which critics can fulfil the direction of Matthew Arnold to get themselves out of the way and let humanity decide. Either they may examine which of their enthusiasms and opinions are general—and limit themselves to a discussion of these; or, seeking to share the widest and deepest experiences, they may become as far as possible an epitome of mankind, "typical" as men. Hazlitt chose the latter method.

The essential originality of Hazlitt as a critic is to be sought in the loyalty he paid not to society, nor to good sense, nor even to consistency of opinion, but to that microcosm of humanity he realized himself to be. "I intend these essays as studies of human nature", he wrote of his own work, "and as in the prosecution of this design I do not spare others, I see no reason why I should spare myself".

Hazlitt's literary criticism, so voluminous and wide of range, gains its essential excellence from the penetration of his own self-knowledge; he is never far from analysing his own consciousness and character. His portraits of other authors are portraits of himself put into their place, and where for any reason he feels that he cannot substitute part of his own wide experience of life for that part of the author's which is expressed, he fails as an interpreter. It is typical of him thus that the essay "On the Past and Future" deals with his own past and his own future. "All we know, think of, or can admire", he says, "in a manner becomes ourselves . . . I am as sure . . . of what passed through Raphael's mind as of what passes through my own". If as a young man Hazlitt could express himself with most satisfaction as a philosopher, during his middle years he turned to a less highly imaginative way of criticizing—and drew interest from all the capital of his mind in order to write his literary judgments. He came to express himself with some definiteness in this exercise and feel free.

Like Johnson, Hazlitt could have declared his writings to be an appeal to experience—and to an experience as individual and uninfluenced by others before he started to fashion it for himself as any man's. The society to which Johnson belonged was, however, becoming degenerate by 1800. Critics had once more to seek within their own minds for the criteria of their judgments, and in so far as they were men deficient in personal experience or self-scrutiny, their criticism was defective. The attraction of the romantics to the study of history was partially due to the failure of contemporary society to provide standards of any kind to which unimpeachable appeal might be made. By studying history they deepened their understanding of human nature and therefore of themselves. It was his own humanity which Hazlitt transformed into capital for his criticism. He never sought to force judgment upon experience. Acute of mind and sense he saw both in the world around him and in the world which was himself the materials for a power of observation most eager and delicate. His prime virtue is a spirit of penetration. He enters as it were into the conception of the author he is studying, discerning that author's purpose as well as at the same moment judging his success in the achievement of it. He has a power of taking a delight in a thing not as a means to some end, but just because it is what it is, and he is always at his greatest when most excited. He captures in his own mind the books and subjects of his criticism and trusts to a capturing with them of the essential atmosphere they breathe in order to live. Because of the wideness of his human interests he can say to an author, "Give me something fine in any form which may suit you best, according to your own temperament", and proceed to judge the result only in relation to the nature of the attempt. At forty he still has the fine ability for

enthusiasm, the creativeness of vision, typical of youth. Yet the possession carries with it its own dangers. Where a particular book does not interest him he is a less reliable critic of it than many of his inferiors in acumen. But it is rare for any good book not to challenge his interest, and, as Sainte-Beuve says, *"Savoir bien lire un livre en le jugeant chemin faisant et sans cesser de le goûter, c'est presque tout l'art du critique"*. Hazlitt seldom ceases to relish the book he is criticizing.

The freshness and virility of his criticism is in fact largely dependent upon the reverence he pays to first impressions. "First impressions", he writes, "are often the truest . . . We are struck at first, and by chance, with what is peculiar and characteristic; also with permanent traits and general effect; this afterwards goes off in a set of unmeaning, commonplace details". He seems, like Dr. Johnson, rarely to have forgotten the feelings with which a book affected him on first acquaintance. For if he found it hard to forget his hatreds, he found it hard also to forget his joys. He is usually more concerned with the spirit and flavour of a book than with the work as a finite object. On the whole he prefers plays and novels to essays and descriptions; and his chief interest in Shakespeare, unlike that of Coleridge, lies in the actual men and women of the plays. He had succeeded better as a painter of portraits than of landscapes —his "Lamb" in the National Portrait Gallery shows a rare eye for character. His best book, *The Spirit of the Age,* is indeed a series of pen portraits—though we may well regret that it does not contain a "Mr. Hazlitt".

Hazlitt's vivid sense that the men of the past were once as vital and human as his own contemporaries goes far to atone for his deficiency in historical information. "I conceive", he says, "that the past is as real and substantial a part of our being, that it is as much a *bone fide,* undeniable consideration in the estimate of human life, as the future can possibly be". His consciousness of time is illustrated in one aspect by his intense realization of his own development. He comes easily to "discover" a period through study of its literature or painting. Yet he is by temperament compelled to desire the past that is dead to bury its dead. "It is", he says, "by an especial dispensation of Providence that languages wear out; as otherwise we should be buried alive under a load of books and knowledge". The sight of a newspaper thirty years old is enough to give him a fit of the spleen for half an hour, yet Burke's *French Revolution* lives on "glossy as ever" within his mind.

Any condemnation which Hazlitt metes to an author is rarely due to lack of knowledge, for about those of whom he knows little he is content to write little. Yet if his systematic study of literature is small, the amount of knowledge he picked up "by the way" in his wide reading is astonishingly great. He took no delight in restrict-

ing literary refinement to his own age. Most authors he likes simply because he likes himself; even living poets he sees not as confined to and limited by their own time but as freely walking the ages. Detailed historical study is after all not the task of a critic as critic, though often a necessary preparation to fit him to become one.

Hazlitt's use of quotations may likewise be defended by considering the type of historical imagination to which his mind found itself suited. He never really wished to employ a quotation for its own sake, indeed he summons one to his aid either as a touchstone or as belonging not to another author but already his own. It is as if the river of his thought sometimes flows through a channel cleanly cut by a thing read long ago. He has little rote memory or capacity for carrying about in his mind knowledge which did not belong to him. "I have the love of power", he says, "but not of property". He enforces his arguments with a passion of remembrance of which quotations are merely a symptom.

Hazlitt's criticism is that of a man interpreting to himself—and only in the second place to an audience—his own experiences, but inspired to do so by stimuli found in his reading. What he says of Rousseau is equally true of himself:

> He had the most intense consciousness of his own existence. No object that had once made an impression on him was ever after effaced. Every feeling in his mind became a passion . . . Hence his enthusiasm and his eloquence, bearing down all opposition . . . his keen penetration and his strange want of comprehension of mind.

By writing his criticism Hazlitt kept himself adapted to the world, transforming the *naïve* data of sense into food for mental life. Unlike that of Coleridge his personality was well-disciplined. "What I have once set my hand to", he says, "I take the consequences of and have always been pretty much of the same humour in this respect". Coleridge's mind lay open to suggestions from a new direction every few months, but Hazlitt never greatly changed the number or the scope of his interests and appreciations from youth upwards; he mothered and fostered his own opinions very tenderly. Coleridge's family of ideas was much more cosmopolitan than Hazlitt's, much more subject to profit and loss, but also much less orderly. It is from his abilities as a psychologist rather than as a philosopher that Hazlitt makes at least primary appeal as a critic. His strength lies in the definiteness with which imaginative impressions formed themselves in his mind—so that in his criticism he could be minute, assigning his reasons often and his first impressions always. He maintained the courage of his convictions over long periods because these convictions he identified so nearly with himself. An introspectionist of worth can never be a hypocrite, for hypocrisy is first of all an imposition of one upon oneself, a lack of

determination to face the facts of one's own character. When Hazlitt critically condemns a work that is popular, he is at pains, for his own sake, to search out the causes of its popularity.

In its capacity for the clear expression of thought Hazlitt's style excels that of Coleridge. His criticism, acutely dogmatic, carries with it all the virtues of definiteness and likes to say the same good things to every reader. Epigrams are common in his work, for Hazlitt is as economical of words as in native temper. He is judicious in his choice of adjectives and it is through these that much of his excitement and acuteness find utterance. Thus he classes the mind of Coleridge as "tangential", and refers perceptively to the Muse of Crabbe as having "something not only rustic but menial in her aspect". In a famous passage he himself writes a defence of the *mot juste*. Yet, definite though Hazlitt is in style and opinions, his essays are not shapely of form. New arrivals to his thought are made welcome at any time, and his criticism is radiant in suggestions even to itself.

In the essay on "Genius and Common Sense", typical of his style at its best, Hazlitt points out that "in art, in taste, in life, in speech, you decide from feeling and not from reason". His critical judgments themselves owe no debt to externally imposed standards. In them fact goes hand in hand with feeling, to be given a meaning by its presence; for Hazlitt proclaimed his opinions as part of his feelings, freely realizing when in command of himself that, if the verdict of the ages was or came to be in contradiction to his own opinion, that opinion was probably wrong. He says:

> It is not enough to show that there is no reason for a thing that we do not see the reason of it; if the common feeling, if the involuntary prejudice sets in strong in favour of it, if, in spite of all we can do, there is a lurking suspicion on the side of our first impressions, we must try again, and believe that truth is mightier than we.

The criticism of Hazlitt in fact is essentially disinterested, and disinterested for the same reason as is the work of a genuinely creative artist—because he allowed the experiences obtained from life and books to be limited only by his free ability to perceive, the position in time natural to him, and the education he had been given. Hazlitt went back to nature for the materials of his judgment. His criticism is not "an enunciation and detailed application of principles", for such principles are never to be separated from actual occasions save by abstraction. The principles which are implicit in Hazlitt's criticism are only deducible from it *a posteriori*. A critic worthy of the name ought not to be merely an analyst, devoid of preferences and passions. Hazlitt's desire for sincerity of expression was too fundamental to permit him to be such a man. Then he would

have said things of which he could not be sure, whereas now he was sure at least of his impressions.

The impersonality of his criticism is therefore not to be looked for as distinct from its individuality, any more than Hazlitt, in so far as he is seen as a "universal", typical figure, is thereby seen any the less as like no one else. To be disinterested is not to be less interested but interested more widely and deeply, and there is no absolutely impersonal critic simply because no one is absolutely an individual. Hazlitt's criticism, save when flagrantly prejudiced, is curiously unegotistic. He is too interested in all his opinions to identify himself with any limited group of them; and his misjudgments—fewer in number than often thought—of contemporaries arise only from his unwillingness to journey far enough from the object to see it in perspective.

At his best Hazlitt comes to know a book as a close acquaintance knows a man; and, as every man becomes a little different in the presence of each separate friend, so Hazlitt is individualized afresh in his treatment of particular books. If the greatness of a critic consists in his ability to represent many men and periods, then Hazlitt was a great critic. "It is not books", says Daniel in his *Defence of Rhyme,* "but only that great book of the world and the all overspreading grace of heaven that makes men truly judicial". It was Hazlitt's intelligence, his delicacy and liveliness of sense, his reverence for intuition, his power to introspect and ability to express, that made him a judge of literature as well as life and a writer whose works are still able to delight us and to animate our own powers of judgment.

A book that all ministers should make a point of reading is Mr. E. E. Kellett's **The Story of Dictatorship from the Earliest Times Till To-day* (Nicholson & Watson, 4s. 6d.). Mr. Kellett writes in his usual pleasant style and from the Hebrews and Greeks on he tells of tyrants of different types. He relates the ancient story to our modern dictatorships, and concludes with some pointed words about the need for thought and vigilance if liberty is to be secured and maintained.

Of the making of books about Swift there is no end, and Mr. Bertram Newman's *Jonathan Swift* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is a competent study of one whose life and writings both contain much of mystery. Mr. Newman tells us no more about the Dean, Stella, and Vanessa than was already known, but with Swift's relationship with the two women, as with his activities in literature and politics, he deals adequately. The bibliography and notes are scholarly and sufficient, and the style readable (in one place we have "Steel" for "Steele").

GUIDANCE AND MAGIC.

By M. Chaning-Pearce, M.A.

The doctrine of "guidance" has always been, and must ever be a pivotal doctrine for all real religion. The "Group" and other similar movements in modern religion have made it salient and challenging. But it is not only a pivotal doctrine for religion; it is also the *raison d'être* of magic, and as narrow as is the dividing line between religion and magic, so narrow is the division between a religious and a magical conception of "guidance". An examination of the significance of guidance in magic will afford some gauge for its manifestations in the religious life.

Although in practice it may not always be easy to distinguish between a magical and religious doctrine of "guidance", there can be little doubt about the fundamental distinction between them in principle. Since the conception of guidance implies a guiding power other and greater than man, it involves also contrasted conceptions of that power and of the mode of its guidance which may be broadly distinguished as, on the one hand, that of natural, and, on the other, that of, in the Christian connotation of that term, revealed religion. The former looks to a power which, though infinitely greater and more potent than human nature, is still of the order of nature and natural life; the latter looks to that which is both natural and supernatural, both transcendent and immanent. The characteristic approach towards the power invoked by the former is that of magic, the placation and exploitation of its forces by means of spell, sorcery, exorcism, and mimetic ritual; of the latter, ethics, a conversion of heart and will, and a reunion of human life with the life of God.

For Sir James Frazer magic is the *"fons et origo"* of religion—a conclusion which has latterly fallen into dispute. It may be said that the tendency of modern anthropology is to consider religion and magic rather as parallel, though interacting and overlapping, activities, than as derivative, the former from the latter. However this may be, in his broad delineation of the nature of magic Sir James is at one with what would seem to be the general consensus of modern opinion upon this matter.

In magic, he says[1],

> . . . man essayed to bend nature to his wishes by the sheer force of his spells and enchantments before he strove to coax and mollify a coy, capricious or irascible deity by the soft insinuation of prayer and sacrifice.

"By magic", says Professor Julian Huxley[2],

1 *The Golden Bough*, I. Pt. i. 284. 2 *Science and Religion.*

is meant the idea that mysterious properties and powers inhere in things and events and that these powers can be in some measure controlled by appropriate formulas or ritual acts.

"The key-note of all magical belief", says Professor Malinowski[3],

is the sharp distinction between the traditional forces of magic on the one hand and the other forces and powers with which man and nature are endowed. . . Magic is akin to science in that it always has a definite aim intimately associated with human instincts, needs, and pursuits. The magic art is directed towards the attainment of practical aims.

Thus, whatever difference of opinion may exist as to the relationship between magic and religion, it will be seen that, as to the salient characteristics of magic, these high authorities are agreed. Magic supposes a certain dark power in life the aid of which, so primitive experience suggests, can be enlisted for the use of man in certain ways and in certain contingencies. This power is superhuman, and so far magic marches with religion.

But there the community of conception seems to end, for in pure magic there is no suggestion that this power is supernatural or divine in the Christian sense, that is, that it proceeds from a Being Who both comprehends and transcends the life of this world. On the contrary, the power which magic seeks to placate or invoke seems rather to be the unknown powers of that life itself, a "life-force" which, from his limited experience of life, the magician has every reason to suppose will be capricious, cruel, dangerous, and violent, and no cause to imagine that it will be actuated or can be approached either by reason or love. The conception seems to be rather that of a terrible and mighty magnification of the natural life man knows too well, "other" than the life he knows only in the sense that it is infinitely greater, not in that it is essentially other in kind and motive.

That this is so the character of the fertility cults and deities with which it is ever closely associated seems to corroborate. This dark power is natural life itself, all that unknown ocean of life and occult potency which surrounds the little known islet of human consciousness. It is assumed that, though on a scale awful to contemplate, it corresponds with the life that is known, since, though infinitely greater, it is eventually the same in kind. "What happens within, happens also without him; and what goes on within him, also takes place without him"[4].

Hence he has what M. Lévy-Bruhl has termed a *"participation mystique"* with this dark power (a power which Professor Jung would seem to correlate with his "collective unconsciousness"), and, by virtue of his inner correspondence with it, can, though with dread, draw upon its resources by mimetic and dramatic representation, in

3 *Science, Religion and Reality*, 72, 79.
4 C. G. Jung, *Contributions to Analytical Psychology*, 113.

the microcosm of his own consciousness, of the sequence, the life and death rhythm, of the mighty forces of the dark macrocosm beyond his ken. Since his experience of life gives him no reason to suppose that this greater life will respond to any rational appeal, his invocation of it is confined to such mimetic and dramatic representations and to such word and action patterns as have been found efficacious in the past, patterns which tend to become continually more formal and fixed. The more man lives under the sway of magic the more full and perpetual is his *participation mystique* with this dark power.

Again, the end of magic is essentially not spiritual or intellectual or moral, but material, amelioration; it is a means of manipulating an otherwise obdurate life-force to man's will; life is sought for the maintenance or intensification of life. Thus magic is mainly concerned with such diurnal and practical matters as rain-making, success in battle, the fertility of crops and herds and women, in fact, with the promotion of prosperity in man's life and affairs in accordance with the ancient formula—"Out with Famine, in with Health and Wealth". Hence its close connexion with fertility cults and phallic worship.

Both in the art and end of magic, therefore, reason is at a discount and critical doubt taboo. For magic is essentially a practical art with much use for traditionally efficacious spell and formula and rite, and little for reason, which (given the magical premise) is rightly regarded as a dangerous and subversive presence at essentially non-rational invocations and exorcisms. And, since the occult power which it invokes is applied rather to problems of living than of being, where contemplation and thought are concerned magic is rarely in evidence, and, where magic rules, thought and contemplation tend to be obscured; the trend of magic is always rather towards extraversion than introversion. Therefore magic always tends to set strongly towards anti-intellectualism and the deprecation of rational enquiry.

It is to be noted, moreover, that magic demands passivity rather than activity in its votaries. In full magic the *rôle* of man is restricted to the due performance of the fixed traditional ritual or formula which sets the magic in motion. He cannot, while the magical force is in the field, either aid (save by a full surrender to or *participation mystique* with its power) or hinder the forces which he has thus released and which, he trusts, will fight for him in that dark region where his arms are unavailing.

In a more partial magic, where the entry of this dark power into the field of human consciousness is limited to the indication of its will by signs, omens, or oracular utterances, his activity is strictly circumscribed by the occult direction which he has received, and his intellectual effort limited to the correct interpretation of that direction, of which he becomes, thereafter, rather the automatic instrument

than the active ally. In no sense and at no time is he ever the friend or ally of this dark power; he is either its helpless victim or its sycophantic servant. The conception of magic of this relationship is ever rather that of possession by than of co-operation with this power with which magic is concerned.

Thus "righteousness", for magic, consists, not in co-operation or identification with the action and life of God—not, strictly speaking (since action is free), in action at all, but rather in an obedient passivity which renders the human organism more and more the mere channel for the flow of this more-than-human power.

Finally, there would seem to be a close connexion between magic and a certain unthinking and irresponsible cheerfulness. The cause seems not far to seek; when magic is in the field and faith in its power sufficiently strong, man is released both from his fear of the dark and from the onerous necessity of continuing the struggle in his own strength. The primitive man, whose magic seems propitious and magicians efficacious, is a cheerful and irresponsible soul, and the craving to return to so desirable a state of mind would seem to be a chronic form of racial infantilism. For magic this happy insouciance is a virtue. The greater the optimism, the greater the faith; the greater the faith, the greater the power of the magic. Thus, to quote Professor Malinowski again: "The function of magic is to ritualize man's optimism"[5]:

To sum up: the salient characteristics of magic would seem to be first, faith in a certain dark power of life which is presumed to be similar in kind though infinitely greater in degree than the natural life man knows, a power which is deemed to be capricious, violent, and dangerous; second, faith in a correspondence between man and this power which can be exploited for his own ends; third, a primarily utilitarian and practical employment of the power of magic; fourth, an entirely non-rational machinery for the purpose; fifth, and in consequence, a marked and constant anti-intellectualism; sixth, a passive response to the action of this power; seventh, a cultivated optimism.

Such is magic. What is the magical equivalent to "direct guidance"? From the foregoing survey of the characteristics of magic, it seems clear that the intervention of the power which it invokes in human affairs is of two kinds, either a full intervention in which this dark power takes the control of his life out of man's hands, while he can only wonder and wait till the visitation is at an end, or, more commonly, a partial intervention in which, by omen, divination, or oracle, man receives a hint of the dark will which it is his business to interpret as clearly as he can and fulfil as punctiliously as he may.

The former type of intervention can hardly be described as guidance, but it is to be noted that it is the condition towards which magic seems inherently to aspire, that is, towards complete possession by

5 *Science, Religion and Reality*, 83.

the power. The latter type, though it may cogently be argued that in reality this too is rather of the nature of direction than guidance properly considered, affords the closest parallel to that which religion means by divine guidance. And of this second class the oracular medium of intervention is that which is most clearly analogous to "direct guidance".

The term "oracle", as its derivation suggests, properly implies speech. The oracle is either itself the message from the power invoked, or the medium of such a message. In the form of oracle that power, invoked by various magical mechanisms, intervenes partially and sporadically in human affairs. Here man is used as its instrument, but the oracle is rather in the nature of command than counsel. Its truth, if only it can be comprehended, is beyond dispute; the exercise of man's understanding is confined to the unravelling of its meaning, and his will to its execution.

The oracle or message is conveyed by many means: by direct, if cryptic, speech; by omens; or by divination of many kinds. In each case the fundamental conception is the same; whether by the flight of birds, by the entrails of animals, by water, by rod, or by words, the unseen power conveys its direction to man who seeks its aid, and in each case a certain traditional, irrational, and magical procedure is necessary to evoke it. It is with verbal oracles that we are here particularly concerned.

Such verbal communications from the dark power are conceived to be either mediate in some natural object or person, or immediate, a voice "from heaven", such as the *Bath Qôl* of *Mark* 1^{11}. But such immediate utterances are rarely met with and, when they occur, they are usually, as in the case of the *Bath Qôl*, composed of oracles previously mediated through persons in earlier prophecy. In earlier animistic phases the voice is identified with the natural object in which the power is conceived to be present, as in the speaking trees and wells of Semitic mythology; in later phases the utterance is conveyed through a human medium at a particular spot or in a particular condition, and it is just here that the dividing line between magic and religion becomes most difficult to demarcate.

Magic manticism and religious prophecy are not easily distinguished, and are constantly found to be intermingled. There can be no doubt that the greatest of the Hebrew prophets believed themselves to be the mere mouth-piece of Jahvé, that the oracular element is prevalent even in the most sublime of their utterances, and the conception and state of ecstasy and possession more or less common to them all. In what then lies the essential difference between religious prophecy and magic manticism?

There can be no doubt, to quote Professor T. H. Robinson, that "the Ecstatic was the direct ancestor of the Prophets"[6], or that the

[6] *Prophecy and the Prophets*, 35.

sublimest utterances of Hebrew prophecy are in lineal descent from those of such as the *kâhin* of primitive Semitism, the man with the veil, who, hiding his face from the world, sought the dark and secret wisdom, or the ecstatic *nâbi* of the age of Samuel. "There is no discontinuity", pronounced Dr. J. Skinner[7],

> in the development of prophecy from the older Nabi'ism of the period from Samuel to Elisha, to the new type of prophecy inaugurated by Amos.

Nor does there seem to be any essential difference, in the manner in which the power delivers its utterances, between the "dream-oracles" of Greece and the trance-visions of Ezekiel. It cannot be affirmed with any fidelity to the known facts that, with the progress of religion, the element of ecstatic possession and impersonal utterance, although it may perhaps be shown to have become a subsidiary mode, is ever entirely eliminated.

The Pauline phenomenon of "speaking with tongues" and the many instances in *Acts* of the reputed reception of the most precise injunctions upon the most practical matters are a further clear testimony to the contrary. Ecstatic possession, the reception of oracular messages, are a constant, if perhaps a diminishing, element in the history of religion as we know it, as of manticism and magic. It would be a dubious and dogmatic judgment which would venture to assert that the condition of ecstasy, trance, or dream, of apparent suspension of the normal faculties and personality, may not be, as less sophisticated ages have always believed, a peculiar, if rare, vehicle for the divine wisdom, and one not necessarily alien to religion. The possibility, even the desirability, of such "direct guidance" for religion cannot therefore be arbitrarily scouted.

There is this to be observed, however—and it is an observation of importance—that while for religion prophecy has tended to be the main and manticism the minor channel of divine communication, in pagan cults in which the magic element is predominant the reverse has been the case. The characteristic medium of revelation for religion has been and still is, a mediate prophecy, and therefore a form, not of direct or absolute, but of indirect or relative, guidance, the speaking forth by the prophet in his own tongue and through the medium of his own personality and experience of the divine counsel; the characteristic medium of revelation for the pagan cults dominated by magic is the person or thing possessed by the power. The history of Hebrew prophecy is the history of a continual and conscious separation of the prophet from the mere ecstatic. For religion, ecstasy is the abnormal mode by which the divine counsel is conveyed; for magic it is the normal mode in which the direction of the dark power is ascertained. For the one the trend is towards

[7] *Prophecy and Religion.*

prophecy, for the other to continue and to stereotype manticism.

But the main difference lies in the conception of the power which the oracle voices. For religion it is a God who becomes more and more distinct from the fertility-baals, the dark life-force, of magic, a God Who increasingly demands love, a "contrite spirit", and "a clear life ensuing", rather than placatory sacrifice or mimetic power-inducement; for magic and fertility cult that power remains a life-force to be invoked and placated, making no demands upon men other than a curious and punctilious *participation mystique*. It is significant that the earliest of the Greek oracles which we know are associated with a vent in the earth through which it was supposed that the earth-goddess, *Gaia,* made known her will. It is, apparently, to such a life-force, such an earth deity, immanent in life, to which magic makes its appeal; religion turns to the Life of life, a God Who is not only immanent but transcendent.

Moreover, where the phenomenon of ecstatic utterance occurs in religion it is a rare and not a general phenomenon, the acme of a life of intense dedication in persons of rare calibre, and is, so far as our records show, unaccompanied by any of the paraphernalia of magical rites and formulas. It was with a passionate emphasis that Hebrew prophecy dissociated itself from the "schools of the prophets", for whom such ecstasy was deliberately induced by mechanical means, and conceived to be at the call of all who would or could employ them.

Thus the main characteristics of magical and pagan as distinct from religious oracles would seem to be, first, that, for the one, wholesale possession by the power is the rule, for the other the exception; second, that while the one tends to remain in a static state of manticism, the other shows a dynamic movement which is, on the whole, away from manticism and towards prophecy; third, that, for the former (as indeed for the latter also) direct oracular guidance is held to be the prerogative of exceptional persons in exceptional states and never the perquisite of the majority of believers; fourth, that the former is almost invariably accompanied by set ritual acts of formulas, located in certain numinous sites and limited to prescribed states, while, for the latter, the element of ritual inducement and fixed locality or state grows progressively less pronounced; fifth, that while the one calls upon some power analogous to the modern conception of a life-force for material boons, the other turns to a God both immanent in and transcendent to the life of man primarily for forgiveness of sin and urged by a "hunger and thirst after righteousness".

Upon this examination, the following general characteristics would seem to be common both to certain quasi-religious doctrines of "guidance" and to those of magical cults—a tendency to conceive the source of "guidance" as an occult power from which brief, precise, and oracular messages can be received by means of a certain

stereotyped procedure which tends to become standardized and invariable, the invocation of this power mainly for practical and material purposes, a marked anti-rationalism, a predominantly passive and receptive attitude towards a state of "possession" by the power, a carefully cultivated cheerfulness and optimism.

The transition or reversion from religion to magic is ever an easy one; an age of doubt, disillusionment, and insecurity, such as our own, is evidently peculiarly prone to it. Where such characteristics of magic are present and prominent in the teaching and pursuit of "guidance" it seems, therefore, not unjustifiable to suspect the presence of one more aspect of what is undoubtedly a strong proclivity of our time towards the "re-instatement of an earlier condition" and reversion to a former level of culture. Such a reversion is so wholly contrary to real religion and so disastrous in its ultimate issue that now, as ever, it would seem that it can hardly guard against the insidious invasion with too scrupulous a care.

THE HYMN SOCIETY.

Readers of this journal will be interested in the recently formed Hymn Society of Great Britain and Ireland, which attempts to bring into fellowship and co-operation those responsible for the production of hymn-books and those with special interest in hymnology. The Society will pool knowledge and resources, and bring people of all churches into association, and in addition has set itself for its first task the preparation of a supplement to Julian's *Dictionary of Hymnology,* which will bring it up to date. It will also stimulate the search for new hymns. The President of the Society is the Archbishop of York, the Vice-Presidents Canon Harold Anson, Sir Walford Davies, Rev. R. C. Gillie, Rev. A. S. Gregory, Archdeacon L. S. Hunter, Dr. Elvet Lewis, Prof. R. A. S. Macalister, Dr. A. Macmillan, Dr. Albert Peel, Lord Wark, and the Very Rev. D. F. Ruddell Wilson. Canon G. W. Briggs and Dr. J. R. Fleming are Joint Chairmen of the Executive Committee, and the Hon. Secretaries are the Rev. G. Currie Martin and the Rev. F. Sanderson, to whom inquiries should be addressed. The minimum subscription is 2s. 6d. per year.

A MEDLEY OF MISPRINTS.

By E. J. Roberts.

Many a true word, says the proverb, is spoken in jest. And many an amusing word is printed without any amusing intention. Not, of course, that misprints are always amusing, for they can often be quite otherwise. The victim of them—the author or speaker of whose meaning havoc has been made—is much more likely to find them annoying. In his *Autobiography* G. K. Chesterton relates that the printer of his school magazine changed the words "a penny bun of the sticky order" into "a peony but of the stick order". "It was", he goes on to say,

> the beginning of a long career of martyrdom from misprints, which reached its crown when I wrote of a nonconformist minister, "a distinguished correspondent", and it came out as "distinguished co-respondent".

Provided, however, that one is not oneself being martyred, the detection of misprints is a harmless hobby from which a good deal of amusement may be derived. In this article I propose to record a few of the more entertaining specimens which have come under my notice.

Most of them, naturally enough, are from the columns of the daily press: for the hurried conditions of newspaper production do not admit of proof-reading being done with as much care as in the case of a book. Taking those conditions into account it is, indeed, rather surprising that misprints in newspapers are not met with far more frequently.

Some years ago a report of a ladies' tennis match happened to catch my eye in the Scottish *Daily Record.* The result was given thus: "Miss Shivas repeated Miss Parrott 6-2, 6-4"—a mistake which would have had even greater aptness if the fortunes of the encounter had been reversed.

I think it was the *News Chronicle* which stated that "Lady Alice Scott is a great opponent of Scottish dances"—thus asserting almost exactly the opposite of what we may suppose the reporter to have written.

On the front page of the same paper, in a paragraph in heavy type reporting one of several inconclusive findings on the part of the League of Nations during the early days of the Italo-Abyssinian dispute, reference was made to "the nations compromising the League". A shrewd thrust, however unintentional: so shrewd, indeed, that one could almost suspect the compositor of being guilty of malice aforethought.

At a later stage in the Abyssinian campaign readers were informed that "The plane reached Koramuch, but encouraged bad weather and returned to its base". Was the "malice aforethought" this time due to a sneaking sympathy with the Abyssinians on the aviator's part?

It was probably in connexion with the same deplorable campaign that I read of "a war of attraction"—a malapropism with a distinctly Irish flavour about it.

In January of this year I saw—again in the *News Chronicle*—that among movements which have tended to increase the interest in spoken poetry "may be mentioned the Oxford Reputations, begun in 1923 by the Poet Laureate". (Query: Are Reputations got by Repetitions of Recitations?) A friend to whom I showed this blunder capped it a few moments later by pointing out, on another page of the same issue, a paragraph about a baby girl of 25 oz. who was "fed with brandy and water from a mountain pen filler". Misinterpretation of the shorthand script might account for the former of these two mistakes, but hardly for the latter.

The most atrocious misprint I ever lit upon was in a small weekly paper in the north of Scotland. A special preacher had been visiting one of the local churches, and in the report of the service the words of his text were printed thus: "Take my joke upon you". Curiously enough in the same paper at Armistice time last year a confusion between the letters "j" and "y" occurred again, the other way round, it being stated that during the two minutes' silence "the only yarning note" was that of a heedless lorryman's shrill whistle. (No, Mr. Printer, not "headless").

On another occasion the same paper reported concerning an aristocratic couple, recently wedded, that they had "been spending a locus-eating holiday in the South of France"—just the kind of holiday in which people with a high-powered car at their disposal and a somewhat shaky knowledge of botany and of Latin would be likely to indulge.

In papers of such deserved repute as the *Observer* and the *Manchester Guardian* misprints occur more frequently than one might expect; but not many are really pithy. Seldom, if ever, have I found one as felicitous as the following. A tablet had been unveiled, in the parish church of Ightham, in Kent, to the memory of Benjamin Harrison, the village grocer, who had discovered in the neighbourhood a large quantity of prehistoric flint implements, "thereby" (I quote from the *Observer*) "making the scientific world his debtor and promoting investigations into the ambiguity of man". The antiquity of man is undoubtedly very considerable; but that his ambiguity is even more so few who know him will dispute. What more signal instance of it could be found than the fact that, gifted with implement-making skill, he spends so much of that skill in producing implements of war? I need not stay to enlarge upon the rich suggestiveness of

this mistake, which I regard as the plum of my collection.

In my own mind I connect with it a misprint in a book by an Anglican bishop, published recently by the S.P.C.K. Reference is there made to "the scene where the Maker of the Universe lay swaddled in a manager". And a few moments after spotting that one I noticed in the *British Weekly* a well-known line of Shakespeare garbled thus—"the expense of spirit in a caste of shame".

Here, too, may be mentioned the following gem, culled from the correspondence columns of the *Listener* in May this year: "Force in the shape of a scourge of chords was employed by the Son of God in connection with the Jewish profiteers". One is tempted to remark by way of comment that at all events some of the chords employed by modern composers have enough scourging quality about them to empty any temple or other edifice in which they may be heard.

Mr. Frank Swinnerton, in his excellent book, *The Georgian Literary Scene,* is made to remark, apropos of W. H. Hudson, "The sight of a moral struggle between a draggled blackbird and a relentless chaffinch . . . would start him upon a train of reflection". Some of these misprints have exactly that effect upon me. Later in the book Mr. Swinnerton mentions incidentally that he once saw Mr. A. P. Herbert's *The Secret Battle* advertised as *The Secret Bottle.*

According to Sir James Barrie (as reported in John Bailey's *Letters and Diaries*) it is taken for granted in Strathspey, the home of the Clan Grant, that in the verse in *Genesis* which states "There were giants in those days" the word "giants" is a misprint for "Grants". This must, however, be reckoned as an alleged rather than as an actual misprint: for, as everyone knows, there are no misprints in our Bibles.

In *A Century of Humour,* edited by Mr. P. G. Wodehouse, I stumbled upon what is literally a medley of misprints, a veritable "printers' pie", so delicious that it needs no comment. I copy the paragraph exactly as it appears in the book.

> H. F. ELLIS
>
> is another of the band of typically English humorous writers whose work first gained recognition in the pages of *Punch,* to which he has contributed for agrinuber of years. The entertaining skit on the acmultural school of novelists which is included here is an excellent example of his deft satire.

We expect the B.B.C. to maintain high standards of accuracy. I was the more surprised, therefore, to find in its anthology *The Foundations of Poetry* (1928) a number of rather flagrant *errata.* On p. 70 is the line "and bid the word adieu" (for "world"). In the last stanza of Wordsworth's "Ode to Duty" a familiar couplet becomes

> Give unto me, made slowly wise,
> The spirit of self-sacrifice.

In Byron's "Ode to the Ocean" (from *Childe Harold*) for "Ten thousand fleets" is substituted "Then thousand fleets": and in the last line of the same extract appears

"and laid my hand upon thy name" (for "mane").

Passing over one or two other misprints of less interest here is one, in Browning's "Prospice", which almost merits the epithet "vile":

Then a light, then thy beast,
O thou soul of my soul! I shall clasp thee again,
And with God be the rest!

Let me conclude by calling attention to what, if my suspicions are correct, is a misprint which has remained undetected for nearly three centuries. Henry Vaughan's well-known poem beginning "They are all gone into the world of light" appears in numerous anthologies. An often-quoted stanza is the sixth, which runs

He that hath found some fledged bird's nest may know,
At first sight, if the bird be flown;
But what fair well or grove he sings in now,
That is to him unknown.

This I take to be the reading of the original edition, since it is repeated in every copy of the poem that I have seen. But although it may be what Vaughan wrote I nevertheless take leave to doubt whether it is what he intended to write. An obvious emendation surely is to read "dell" for "well" in the third line: for who has ever heard or heard of a bird singing in a well? It may perhaps be suggested that "beside a spring" is what the poet had in mind; but that is hardly the same thing as "in a well". I submit the correction, however, not without diffidence, for its very obviousness causes me some hesitation. Why has it not occurred to any of Vaughan's editors[1]? If it has occurred to them and been dismissed they must presumably have had good reasons for rejecting it.

One final remark falls to be added. If readers of the present article happen to find themselves chortling over some glaring misprint in it which has eluded the writer's vigilance in proof he cannot but admit that such a mischance would be quite in accord with the fitness of things and with the demands of poetic justice.

1 Since writing this article I find that one editor, Daniel Scrymgeour, in *The Poetry and Poets of Britain* (Edinburgh, 1864) prints "dell" for "well".

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

DENOMINATIONS AND CATHOLICITY.

By the Rev. J. O. Dobson, B.A.

A few years ago a Chinese Christian, eminently fitted for the Christian ministry, was strongly urged by some foreign friends to be ordained. He replied that he would like to become a minister if he could be ordained at a service in which an Anglican, a Presbyterian, a Methodist, and a Congregationalist took part, so that he would be recognized as a minister of all those Churches. Upon being told that that was impossible, he felt unable to become a minister of one denomination. It would look like separating himself from other Christians amongst his own people. He is still a layman. That is how a Chinese Christian felt about the present condition of Christendom. It is a feeling not unknown, indeed, in the West. Not a few young people find it a difficulty that they can only express membership of the visible Christian Church by joining a denomination. "For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it".

Much can be said to explain and justify the present divisions of Christendom. Those who, in earlier centuries, separated themselves, did so reluctantly, under stress of conscience, and with a sense of the responsibility they were undertaking because no other way seemed open to them. By so doing they made an unforgettable witness to certain principles of high importance to the Christian faith. And the organized bodies they founded have mediated spiritual life to vast numbers of people. Their existence as separated bodies was historically necessary, and has been spiritually justified.

But now there is a certain uneasiness at the divided condition of Christendom. Many of the convictions and principles, to vindicate which our Free Church forbears became separate, are at least tacitly recognized. The *zeitgeist* has changed. To remain separated carries with it the onus of justification. It is certainly not a thing to do lightly, or because of difficulties in the way of reunion. This un-

easiness is not so much due to the fact that dividedness impoverishes the whole visible Church, nor that we pay a heavy price in weakened effectiveness in fulfilling the Church's mission in the world, as that our divisions suggest that we cannot yet have fully learned the mind of Christ in this matter. An unthinking acquiescence in things as they are may be a form of disloyalty to the Head of the Church.

Nor can we shut our eyes to the consequences of denominational religion. It bears the defects of its virtues. Our divisions are become old, and antiquity is liable to suggest sanctity. It is easy to assume that a thing is intrinsically good because it is old. We have been born into dividedness. Many, having known nothing different, accept our divisions as "something given". We just acquiesce in the only situation we have known. In consequence, we get into the way of thinking denominationally. We think of the Church primarily in terms of our own polity, mode of worship, theological standpoint, and characteristic *ethos*. We seldom think of the Church as a visible fellowship of Christians, embracing wide variations in tradition and outlook, thought and practice.

A further consequence is ignorance of the ways of other bodies of Christians. Our knowledge of why, and in what, they differ from ourselves, or why they exist as separate denominations, is decidedly vague. This ignorance may lead to impoverishment. We do not realize how our own denominational life might be enriched by some of the distinctive things of other denominations.

More serious, our divisions, by creating the denominational mind, tend to perpetuate themselves. They lead us into contentment with a Church life that is narrowed, less rich, than it might be. We are untroubled by a desire for anything different from, or better than, that to which we are habituated. Some of us may even wonder why other people should desire a different sort of Church from our own. From that it is not a big step to that attitude of standing "over against" other denominations, which is either defensive or self-assertive.

So the denominational mind leads to a radically defective thought of the Church. We think of it in terms of the known, and as something static and fixed, rather than as a developing organic body, or (better) as a developing corporate personality. We have lost the meaning of the word Catholic, which is comprehension. So we do not think of a Christendom visibly united, a Church in which Christians, varying in temperament, mental habit, tradition, theology and mode of worship, might yet all feel at home, and realize that they "belong together".

The difficulty is that most denominations feel that they were called into being by the clear action of the Spirit in order to witness to some specific principle, generally a matter of polity that expresses a doctrine, either of theology or ecclesiology. That principle is their

raison d'être. If, therefore, the idea of reunion be suggested, the instinctive reaction of many is a fear lest any act of reunion should be a surrender of the principle which differentiates them from other bodies of Christians. They make the highly disputable assumption that the particular things for which they have stood as a denomination can only be preserved by their continued existence as a separated body. They forget that the principles for which a denomination stands may be more important than the denomination itself. They would find it difficult to rise to the daring thought that, as a denomination came into existence to vindicate a principle, so a day might come when it might best ensure the perpetual recognition of that principle by itself dying, or by letting its life be merged in that of a more comprehensive Church.

Denominational attachment is indeed a matter to be seriously reckoned with by all who are attracted by the idea of a reunited Church. Every denomination mediates spiritual things to its members, through its fellowship, worship, and sacraments, and any act of reunion must ensure that that corporate spiritual life remains unbroken. But it is a question whether the spiritual life of many Church members is really bound up with conviction of the traditional principles of their denomination. Some, indeed, are zealous for the principles of the denomination into which they were born, or through some circumstance find themselves. Others show less enthusiasm to defend trenches dug long ago, in a warfare in which they wonder whether the time may not have come to call an armistice. For many, it can hardly be denied, denomination is a sentimental attachment. They attend the church in which they feel at home, or for some other adventitious reason. There is a considerable number whose denominational attachment is readily transferred. They are really undenominationalists, having no vital ecclesiastical roots. But any act of unity must carry those of strong denominational conviction, and those whose sole concern is that the Church be free from State. An act of unity which became the occasion of a fresh separation would be calamitous. And most Christians would repudiate as spurious any suggested reunion which was in reality merely absorption or submission.

Any true reunion of Christendom must mean a Church Catholic, in the sense of comprehension, a Church which shall harvest everything of real worth that has been sown in the centuries of division. Our first need is that Christians, finding themselves in this not very satisfactory (and some would say, not very creditable) world of denominations and sects, should begin to look towards a Church more truly Catholic in form and in spirit than any existing Church. If that became the *terminus ad quem* of our thinking about the Church visible, however distant it might seem, then the present situation would at once become easier, more hopeful. We should regard each

denomination, including our own, as for the time being trustee of some theological truth or ecclesiastical principle which is to be perpetuated, not by a separated denomination, but in the life of a greater Church than Christendom has yet known, and we should regard our denominational concerns in the light of the whole witness of that greater Church.

That might well lead to a fresh study of our own denominational position, with a view to determining what, amongst the things we stand for, we regard as so vital and essential to the Church that for the sake of it we would take the responsibility of refusing to join a reunited Church unless that Church accepted it. It would lead further to a new appreciation of what other denominations stand for. This is a matter of some spiritual importance. The essence of discipleship is a willingness to learn. "Love of truth", says Father Kelly, "is shown less in the courage with which we proclaim it—for that may be assertiveness—than in the humility of our readiness to learn". Such a teachable attitude does imply a certain self-criticism, a suggestion of our own denominational incompleteness, a hint that, whatever we have gained and conserved, there may be some things we have missed. And it might lead to a clearer recognition that no existing Church, or sect, is adequate to express the whole meaning of the Church and Gospel. So we might turn to examining the position of other bodies of Christians with a view to discovering, appreciating, and sharing, anything of value in their thought and practice. The suspicion, rivalry, and lurking hostility, which are even now not entirely unknown, would give place to a recognition of those other bodies as allies and friends, to whom we are under obligation for their witness to things we have forgotten or ignored or put aside. Further, instead of emphasizing points of difference, we should emphasize the things upon which separated Christians are united. rightly inferring that matters upon which divided Christians agreed would probably be more fundamental to the Christian faith and life than their differences. Most of all is this mutual appreciation to be fostered by the sharing of one another's worship.

But there are some Christians to whom the idea of a comprehensive, reunited Church makes but small appeal. Such a Church looks so very different from that to which we are accustomed that it does not attract us. It would probably mean the giving up of some cherished denominational ways, habits of Church life, to which we have become attached because they are familiar. And this attachment to accustomed ways leads many, who are not averse to reunion, to want a reunited Church that shall be as little different as possible from the Church or denomination to which they at present belong. If, therefore, they speak of reunion, they really desire something that is more like assimilation or absorption than a true reunion. And this desire leads to an exaggerated denominational zeal. It prompts

them to maximize what they assert to be essential to the Church, and to ask stiff terms of others as the price of their own participation. That attitude would make real reunion impossible. It has been, in fact, the chief cause of our present dividedness. It exalts matters of relative importance into absolutes. Simply put, it is the making of dogmatic statements, theological or ecclesiological, into articles of faith. Pressed home, this leads logically to the assertion that the particular body to which we belong is the true Church, and that, in so far as it may differ from our own, the Churchmanship of others is defective. People, Dr. Headlam remarks, have never really quite believed that, and have invented all sorts of ways of evading a too rigid logic. But, with its implication that some others are without the pale, even a hint that their assurance of salvation is precarious, it has been a devastating controversial device. Both the great traditions have found it serviceable. It has been the real cause both of Catholic rigidity and of the chronic fissiparousness of the Reformed Churches. In this matter of reunion, it will serve the Fabians. But in theology and ecclesiology, the rule holds that things should not be multiplied beyond necessity. Every such exaltation of a dogmatic statement, about which there may well be difference of opinion so long as the Christian faith exists, into an article of faith, is a divisive act. It sets an exclusive Church over against an inclusive Gospel.

As the denominational mind gives place to a true Catholicity, separated Christians may grow together, even into a visibly united Church, not standardized or regimented, but as broadly based and comprehensive as its Gospel will permit. In theology such a Church would allow of widely differing views. It would possess—what many feel to be a very urgent need—a universally-recognized ministry. It would permit of wide diversity in mode of worship, recognizing freely that the spiritual life of different folk may be best nourished by different types of service. In particular, it would recognize as regular more than one order of the administration of Holy Communion, from High Mass or Choral Eucharist to the plainest Ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Communion would be open to all recognized communicant members.

The real difficulties are ecclesiological. A doctrine of the Church seems necessary to any complete theology. The Church is inseparable from the Gospel. There is a true sense in which there is *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. The new life is mediated by an historical fellowship. Yet "the Church" is nowhere defined in Scripture or in Creed. It is here that the promotion of traditional doctrines into articles of faith has multipled obstacles that seem insuperable.

There is no short and easy way to a re-united Reformed Church. Many feel indifferent to the idea. Some are unconvinced that it is desirable, if possible. Christendom, with age, has grown somewhat stiff in limb, sluggish in habit, averse from change. To remain as

we are would avoid discussions that must certainly be protracted, that appear to some to be dull and to others irrelevant to the Church's task, and that, with the best will in the world, it will be hard to prevent from becoming contentious. Yet such pleas afford no relief to that uneasiness at the present dividedness of Christendom. So long as Christians remain separated, the frontiers must be defined and fortified. We harden against one another along the lines of division. The denominational mind is stultifying us. But the very conditions of our age are making self-segregation impossible. They are making our divisions look anachronistic. They must certainly not be perpetuated merely out of stiff-neckedness. William Penn's Society, "where there is at least as much charity as zeal", seems nearer the truth about the Church. An age whose characteristic is the breaking through of barriers is bound to raise questions which are implied in the very existence of other Churches. It may even be that the Spirit will lead us into a catholicity, not only more spacious in temper than Christendom has yet known, nor more adequate to the Church's mission, but more worthy of the Head of the Church.

MODERN PELAGIANISM.

By J. Hugh Stafford, M.A., LL.D.

Pelagius was a theologian of British origin who lived in the latter half of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth. Provoked by the low morality of the time, he taught that the human will has the unfettered power to choose the right, that man can work out his own salvation, and that he can, if only he will, live without sin. These opinions, after enjoying some years of great popularity, were condemned as heretical by a Council.

It is perhaps in a sense prophetic that Pelagius was a native of this country. There seems to be something in the atmosphere which inclines the inhabitants to Pelagianism. The English are particularly prone to morality. Several times in our history religion has had to be rescued from this heresy of Justification by Works and brought back to Justification by Faith. That was, for instance, the chief achievement of Wesley. The time is due, it seems to the present writer, for another rescue.

Why is Pelagianism to be resisted as a heresy? Briefly, because in it there is no need for the Divine Grace, and because it involves a complete misunderstanding of the nature of Sin and of the function of religion. The business of the Church is first and foremost spiritual, not social and philanthropic. The philanthropic activities of our churches, all highly desirable in themselves, are not a satisfactory substitute for a spiritual experience: they are not a means of securing a spiritual experience. There are many societies not con-

nected with a Christian church which provide equally good outlets for philanthropic activity. But the Church has a spiritual function which no other society can perform—to bring the individual soul into immediate personal union with God. That good works will be one of the fruits of such communion is undoubtedly true; but are not some of our churches (and certainly many church-members) putting good works first, possibly with the hope that the spiritual experience will come as a result?

The function of all religion is *not* to make man good, but to reveal God to him, to make him aware of Infinity, to open a window so that he becomes aware of a Universe unknown before which revises all his values, and to pour strength into his soul. No doubt, when a man becomes conscious of God's presence, directing, upholding, inspiring, loving him, he will be good. But morality is a by-product of religion: it is not religion. The perfectly religious man (who, of course, does not exist) is good, not because he thinks he ought to be, but because his mind is so filled with the Beatific Vision of God that there is no room for anything else. He does as he likes, but what he likes is God's holy will. However much we admire the saint, and however much we long to be like him, it is of no use for us to imitate his actions, and to think that therefore we are on the road to sainthood. It is not the actions which make the saint, but the Spirit which produces the actions. That is what we need. Until we have received that, all our imitation will be feeble and partial. In the Gospel we are told, for instance, to love our enemies. Many earnest people endeavour to carry out this precept, and sometimes with some difficulty they succeed in behaving *as if* they loved them. All honour to them! It is certainly better than nothing. But it is not fulfilling the precept.

The highest morality we know is the product of Christianity. Men admire the morality as they see it in action, but they neglect the source. But morality divorced from its living source eventually becomes conventional, dry, legalistic. The present widespread indifference to religion is largely due to this confusion between religion and morality. A man says, "I don't say prayers nor feel any need for religion, because I find I can and do lead as moral a life as many of your Church members"; and if morality is what they are aiming at, perhaps he does. Such a morality, however, is liable to break down under any special strain. In general, this attitude tends to produce a society aiming at the highest measure of selfishness which can be practised without coming into open conflict with one's neighbours, a condition which is inconvenient and disagreeable. Another type of man says bluntly, "You are always telling me I ought to be unselfish and so on. Why should I be? I find it much more comfortable and convenient to be selfish". What answer has morality to that? But religion has an answer.

We are far too inclined in our serious moments to think about and to count up our sins, and to neglect Sin. Sin is a state, and all sins are merely symptoms of Sin. All Sin is one, and to endeavour to correct our sins is to treat the symptoms without attacking the disease. Sin is blindness to God. We are all born blind, and our task in life is to find the cure for our blindness. So long as we remain blind to God, we are living in Sin, and all our morality is only a palliative, not a cure.

Christ came first to save us, and only secondarily to teach us. Indeed religion cannot be taught: it must be experienced. The business of the Church is not to teach, but to persuade people; persuade them to make an experiment, to undergo an experience: persuade them by the testimony of all the saints that the experience is worth while, that they are missing something—the greatest thing in Time and Eternity—the Knowledge of God. The Church has to persuade men who are blind that there is such a faculty as sight, which they may receive if they will open their minds to the Holy Spirit. The cure is a miracle worked by God, not a course of treatment prescribed and carried out by man.

When the Church has persuaded a man to submit to the experience, to put himself into God's hands, can it do anything to help him? The saints agree that prayer is the means by which we prepare ourselves to receive the Holy Spirit. What the Church needs at the present time is a technique of prayer, which it can give to all souls who are seeking for God.

The Church is *first* a philotheist society, and *then* a philanthropic one. The only cure for our fallen world and our blind souls is God. The maxims and advice of morality, the dictates of conscience, are all delusive guides, unless they are permeated and inspired by the Holy Spirit. More than ever, the world needs not good advice, but the Gospel of a Holy and Redeeming God.

EDUCATION IN THE PULPIT AND THE PEW.

By the Rev. R. Bartholomew, B.Sc.

Within the last thirty years a revolution has taken place in higher education in this country. At the beginning of the twentieth century there were in England only five universities—the ancient universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the three universities created during the nineteenth century, London, Durham, and Victoria (Manchester). In the opening years of the twentieth century the universities of Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield, and Bristol were established in rapid succession; and, more recently, the university colleges of Nottingham, Reading, Southampton, and Exeter

have developed into universities, or are on the point of attaining full status as such.

The registered students of the universities and university colleges during the years 1916, 1926, and 1936, together with the number of degrees awarded, are as follows[1]:

Year	Registered students.	Degrees awarded.
1916	49,544	7,093
1926	64,883	11,627
1936	82,682	14,629

It is to be observed that:

(1) the number of students has increased by more than sixty per cent in the course of the last twenty years;

(2) the number of degrees awarded annually has more than doubled;

(3) the number of students entering the universities and university colleges every year is now approximately 27,000, of whom more than half graduate.

The position created by these far-reaching changes in the educational methods and standards of the country, and the consequential changes in the habits of mind and the outlook on life of modern youth, demand of the churches corresponding changes.

The Bishop of Birmingham, preaching some little time ago before the British Association, made a special plea on behalf of young men and women who have had a scientific training at the universities, and many of whom complain bitterly that they cannot get adequate religious teaching. He said:

> They have no more desire for undogmatic religion than for hazy science. But they demand that religious dogma shall be taught with the same frankness, the same readiness to admit progress through change, the same absence of elaborate and unnecessary complication, as they are accustomed to get in scientific instruction. Especially do they resent the use of archaic language, which they suspect, not always unjustly, to be used as a cloak beneath which awkward problems are concealed.

The problem involves, as one of its central considerations, the question of the status and training of the ministry, and the standard of educational attainment to be demanded of ministers.

The minister of the past got his nickname of "parson" from the fact that in many a district of this then poorly educated land he was the "*persona*", which meant, in many cases, that he was the only educated person, and the Church the only channel through which connexion with the world of wider ideas was possible for large numbers of people. That is not so now. Everyone, nowadays, belongs

[1]These figures do not include the very large number of students who attend University Extension courses, W.E.A. classes, and other specialized educational courses.

to a library, reads newspapers, and possesses a wireless set. The standard of general education has so risen that the matriculation standard is being increasingly demanded by corporations and business houses of candidates for posts on their clerical and technical staffs. The range of intellectual interest and activity of the laity has widened to so great an extent, with the enlargement of the bounds of knowledge, that only a ministry that is fully alive to, and sympathetic with, the changes that have taken and are taking place can possibly meet the spiritual needs of active-minded men and women.

The Churches are, however, slow to adjust their standard of ministerial requirement to the exacting demands of to-day. The number of candidates for the Free Church ministry who attend educational courses of University standard is not available. The academic standing of all Free Church ministers is, however, published. The number of them who hold university degrees is, of course, larger than it was twenty years ago; but the increase is not proportionate to that which is reflected in the figures given above.

A University degree is not, of course, a *sine qua non* of a helpful ministry; but it is in the light of university standards that one can, perhaps, best appreciate how the intellectual ferment of these times has affected the life and thought of the Churches and of the community as a whole.

The Church of the twentieth century is manifestly a Church of declining influence and power. It is losing its hold on the spiritual life of the nation. Many of its functions are being exercised by educationists, writers, administrators, and by voluntary religious associations. The spirit of faith, and love, and self-sacrifice is as widespread and active as in previous ages; but it is not confined within the Churches. It is Christian in the broadest sense of the word. There are men and women whose lives are of such exalted quality that in bygone days they would have been accounted saints, but who now stand altogether outside the life and activity of the Churches, for the direction taken by the heroism and disinterestedness of men and women is largely determined by the pressure of the age in which they live.

The position is critical, and calls for the serious consideration of the Churches. The problem divides itself into two parts:

(1) Can Nonconformity reasonably hope for the continued loyal support in the pew of men and women whose outlook on life is larger and more generous, and whose judgment concerning the problems of life is better informed, than that of the pulpit?

(2) Are the Churches enlisting, and making the fullest and most effective use of, the young men and women in their ranks whose fine equipment for their professional careers should constitute a high call to Christian service?

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

ON REACHING FIFTY.

No, my friends, this is not an article about the first half-century of the cricket season, though you will get something about cricket before the article comes to an end. It is going to be a heart to heart talk, or, if you will, a soliloquy within the hearing of those who are good enough to say they like the personal and human note of this section of the journal.

On the last day of winter, the Council of the Congregational Union having left me almost alone at Clacton a day or two previously, I woke about four o'clock and said to myself with a start, "I am fifty to-day". It seemed utterly incredible. Only the day before, so it appeared, I was a boy at school and yet now indubitably I was fifty. Somehow or other seven years of college life, two pastorates, and a host of other things, had intervened: I had met many people, seen many sights, read many books and written a few; and I was fifty.

I must accustom myself to this ridiculous notion—that I am fifty and growing old. Later in the day a youthful member of my family, describing some incident, said, "You know she is getting old, fifty to fifty-three or thereabouts"! Getting old! When do most people wake up to the fact that they are getting old? Of course there are indications—very obvious indications in some of us—long before the half-century is reached. One begins to get wheezy and creaky, and to regard the nature of one's meals before strenuous exercise. For some time I have been conscious that though I could still do my four miles an hour I preferred three and a half, and that the four could no longer be kept up for six or seven or eight hours a day without discomfort. It is now taken for granted that I field at point, and the ground seems much further away than once it did; while I will yet risk a sharp single with the best of them—the youngsters to-day run very badly between the wickets alike in county and local cricket—I prefer a boundary to running a five, as I was made to do last year. Yet, despite these and other warnings, it came as a shock to realize that I was within eight years of the average span of life for my sex and only twenty from the allotted three score years and ten, and to remind myself that if I wanted another pastorate I should be considered too old!

One night since that birthday I dreamed—a very rare occurrence—and horribly realistic and vivid the dream was. I died by drowning; life came to an end, and from beyond it I looked back at a lot of loose ends, unfinished tasks, foundations without buildings, books without print. Never before had I so appreciated the tragedy of lives cut short, with work unfinished; never before had I been so conscious that at any time "the night cometh when no man can work".

I began to look forward to the uncertain years that still remain and to ask what should be done with them. How long, for example, is it possible for a man in middle age to maintain the present speed and the stress of many labours? How soon does one become distressfully conscious of the body and of its growing limitations? Is it inevitable that we should all think and talk so much of ailments as we get older?

I looked back over the last three or four years and asked myself how far I had done the things I had planned. I remembered how I had given up a busy and happy ministry with manifold opportunities for pastoral service among people young and old. For twelve years I had been working at full pressure, generally fourteen hours a day. I wanted time to think,

to research, to read and write and pray, and to spread abroad some ideas which seemed to me of consequence in regard to the future of organized religion.

How far have I done the things I set out to do? It seems, looking back, that I have "scattered terribly". Life has been a greater rush than ever. People have so often assumed that I had nothing to do, and I have found it difficult to resist invitations. The years have been occupied with preaching here, there, and everywhere; with advising about libraries; with a large correspondence about Congregational history, denominational life, and from ministers about their reading and about difficult pastoral cases. All this on top of the routine of editorial and denominational jobs of sundry kinds.

For a large part of this time only the hours from one to seven have been given to sleep, and when the luxury of a "day off" has been secured, it has only been by dint of much arranging. Take yesterday, for example. By the perversity of nature Yorkshire almost invariably come to Lord's to play the M.C.C. when the Congregational hordes come to London for the May Meetings. That knocks out Monday and Tuesday. Yesterday I had determined to get the morning at Lord's before my own game in the afternoon. The state of the ground resulted in the cancellation of the local game and so the day worked out thus:

5.30- 7.30	Reading.
9.45-11.15	At Memorial Hall for urgent proofs, which kept me too late to see the first ball bowled. The day at Lord's, then
8.30- 9.30	Work for to-day's Sunday School Anniversary.
10.30-12.30	Reviewing.

That is fairly typical of a "day off". In parenthesis I may describe the impression made by the day's play for those who look for cricket.

The wicket was a batsman's paradise, the sort of wicket that a man of fifty likes to bat on, something like a cushion, retarding even the fastest ball and giving ample time to see the ball turn. After a rather anonymous Price came the much lauded Compton. He made a shaky start with many sketchy strokes, but he batted with confidence, no doubt encouraged by the close proximity of one of the boundaries, which indeed did much to spoil the match, making sixes common as houses. One shot of his was reminiscent of Hendren at his best, but he was out to a stroke for which many a Sunday School Second Eleven player has received chastisement. I liked Edrich better than Compton on the day's showing: he has the strokes, with a much stronger defence. Hendren batted beautifully for a short time—it is sad to think we shall see no more of him after this year. Yorkshiremen present were rather disturbed at the lack of Yorkshire's old aggressiveness, especially in the bowling: the team was as fine as ever in the field, with Barber outstanding, but there was nothing of the keenness which marked Macaulay and Emmott Robinson. Possibly this was due in part to the fact that it was the first match of the season and not a championship match. One cannot imagine Yorkshire failing to finish off an innings in a championship match as on this occasion—the 30 or 40 runs they allowed the last players to make meant, in the event, the losing of the match. Hutton and Leyland were actually allowed to go on bowling to Aird and Bowes while Smailes and Verity looked on. When Yorkshire went in Hutton only lasted an over or two, so there was no chance to compare him with Compton and Edrich. Sutcliffe batted with all his old elegance, but was out to the last ball of the day.

To return. When one is fifty should one continue life at full speed or turn one's back on it and accept only selected tasks? Perhaps the question is rather whether one can turn one's back on it if one so desires. When at times I think of dropping all my review work for this and other journals I often call to mind C. E. Montague's words about journalism :

> There are kinds of tobacco that often make you swear while you smoke them, and yet you find, if you try, that they have spoilt you for smoking anything else. "It never done no good to me, yet I can't leave it if I will", you say of one of these, as the soldier in Kipling said of the world.
>
> Journalism is something like that. Just wed her, and you'll see what a shrew of a wife she may make—but you'll never leave the dear termagant. All of us who have wedded her call her, at some time or other, every bad name we can lay our tongues to. She lets a lot of us down. She draws on us sneers without end from the bigwigs of literature, the mandarins and the professors. And yet, just think of turning out, for the last time of all, from the lit, living office.

Perhaps the life I live has something like the same hold.

If twenty more years are allowed me, how best can they be spent? Some things certainly ought to be done. An edition of the writings of the fathers of Congregationalism—Browne, Harrison, Barrow, Greenwood, Penry—is sadly needed, and I should very much like to do it. This would fit in with the work on which I have been long engaged, the history of the Puritanism and Separatism of Elizabeth's reign. Lying to hand, too, is valuable material for a history of the constituent colleges now represented by New College, London—Hackney, Homerton, Highbury, Coward, and the rest. Perhaps this can go hand in hand with making our two London Congregational Libraries, at the Memorial Hall and at New College, into serviceable and complementary Libraries for the use of students. Both are exceptionally valuable along lines I must describe some other time.

Sundry other books begin to take shape in the mind, though I hope I shall be able to resist the importunities of publishers for a volume on the personal side of pastoral work. Will there be any leisure for a play and a thriller? Like everybody else I should like to try my hand at these!

It is sometimes said that by the time fifty is reached one is in a groove from which one cannot escape. It would be simpler if it were so. Sometimes I dream of giving the rest of my days to historical research, turning a deaf ear to the claims of denominational committees, declining all invitations to preach and lecture, and refusing the task of reviewing. The mornings at the British Museum, the afternoons for the open, the evenings for reading whatever I pleased. How delightful it would be! Then come doubts, the feeling that such a life could easily be selfish, and the conviction that a man who has heard the call to the ministry should decline no invitation for service that comes along.

Sometimes I dream of life on an island where I dwell with my books and my thoughts, with a diary blissfully empty of engagements, and all distractions far away. Friends smile when I expound this theory of my island home, evidently believing that I am so enmeshed in a varied and hectic life that I should never be happy there but should return like a captive bird to its cage. I wonder? Certain I am of this, that when one reaches fifty the time for some things must be found—time to think, to pray, to read the Bible. Time and again I discover how indescribably wonderful the Bible is and how little I know of its riches. When I think of some books I have spent time in reading at the expense of the study of

the Bible I am indeed appalled. Not long ago in introducing a sermon on one of the Psalms I said that in my experience there were three infallible cures for despondent moods: (1) To spend a day in the country and let nature exercise her healing ministry; (2) To mix with little children; and (3) To steep oneself in the *Psalms*. After the service an old man, a complete stranger, was waiting in the vestry. After telling me something about himself he said, "I was very much impressed, sir, with what you said about the healing power of nature. I wonder if you would send me to Devon for a holiday. If you cannot send me to Devon, Kent will do". He did not go to either by my sending! For all these three things I should like to have time.

> How soon hath Time, the subtle thief of youth,
> Stol'n on his wing my three and twentieth year!

What Milton said when he reached fifty I do not know. He did say:

> To measure life learn thou betimes, and know
> Toward solid good what leads the nearest way.

By the time one reaches fifty one should have learned to measure life. But it strikes me that by that time one is only just beginning to master the rudiments of the art of living.

ALBERT PEEL.

2nd May, 1937.

P.S. June 11th. To save correspondents the trouble, let it be said right away that we are aware that Middlesex have beaten Yorkshire. They fully deserved to do so, and we do not make the excuse that Bowes was away and Smailes scarcely able to bowl. Middlesex were the better side at every point of the game—batting, bowling, fielding, wicket-keeping, and captaincy: Robins's innings was one of the finest we have seen, in conception and in execution: he should be captain of the next English team as he should have been of the last one. The Yorkshire batsmen made a poor show on the last day on a wicket on which Smith made the ball fly (he bowled leg theory, but *fair* leg theory); they seemed to be taking a long view and not risking life and limb in view of future engagements. Nevertheless they should have made a fight of this game. If only Sutcliffe had been available to bat on this wicket he might have repeated his success of the first innings; it was a mistake to send him in for 15 minutes overnight. Congratulations to Robins and Middlesex!

June 12th. Robins *has* been selected as captain of England. A good mark for the selectors!

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS.

A WINTER AT MARBURG.

By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A.

When anyone asks me how I got on in Marburg last winter, I feel inclined to quote from Henry Vaughan :

> If thou canst get but thither,
> There grows the flower of peace,
> The rose that cannot wither,
> Thy fortress and thy ease.

For Marburg is a quiet town, "secure from all annoy". There is never a sound by night, unless it be an occasional ting-tong from a level-crossing, when a train is due ; and by day it is the beating of carpets and mattresses in the gardens, or the Catholic angelus, or the singing of soldiers that one hears, rather than any traffic. By many people the place would no doubt be called dead-alive, but to a tranquil temperament, with a student's interests, it proved exceedingly pleasant. To German ways I quickly grew accustomed—to the frequent hand-shakings and the endless *Bitte-Danke* (please, thank you), to the beds that don't tuck in properly and to eating my fish with two forks, to the series of festivals and even to the repeated *Luftschutzübung* (practice of protection against air raids), which involved decamping to a damp, cold cellar ; what was harder was not to miss certain English things, especially the open fire, but also toast and apple pie and roast potatoes, ethical sermons and the nearness of the sea. (In England we "enjoy" a sea climate, we see the sea whenever we think of a map, we have news of ports in the papers and mention of the sea every night on the wireless ; and then there are all our marine phrases—from "fishy" and "sink or swim" to "not the only pebble on the beach".)

It would be hard to say whether Church or State had the most, but it was the ecclesiastical festivals which impressed me. First there was *Reformationstag* (Reformation Day, Oct. 31), when at last I heard Germans themselves singing *Ein' feste Burg* ("A safe stronghold"), and singing it by heart and actually on their feet ; then came *Buss- und Bettag* (Day of Prayer and Repentance), now foisted on Catholic Germany just as *Fastnacht* (the festival of merrymaking before Lent) is on the Protestants, when all the shops were shut and Sunday clothes the rule ; almost immediately afterwards we celebrated *Totensonntag,* a sort of Protestant All Souls' Day, which meant that the sermons were full of death and burial and the populace flocked to the graveyard. Before we knew where we were, we had come to Advent and were burning candles on all possible occasions, one more every Sunday at breakfast till Christmas, and at Christmas there was a tree with candles in every house, whether there were children in the house or not. All this was sandwiched with secular festivals of sorrow or rejoicing, when the flags came out, with or without crêpe ; it was also punctuated with what *The Times* called the Government's "weekly surprises".

The scenery around Marburg I shall not attempt to describe, since those who have seen it will remember it and to those who have not it is indescribable. To speak of the little old town, climbing fantastically up the side of the hill, of the castle at the top, standing out firmly yet not too sombrely against the sky, of the wooded hills and the enticing walks all around, will not do, because it sounds so ordinary, which is just what Marburg is not.

To those who already love the place, then, I will only murmur the words Spiegelslust, Frauenberg, Ockershausen; the others should read the lines from Vaughan again, use their imaginations, and, if they like the sentiment, go to Marburg.

With the lecture-list and the lectures I was frankly disappointed. From Herr Sippell, whose forthcoming book on Puritanism between 1620 and 1650, called *Werdendes Quäkertum,* will be well worth buying, I learned much in private; but of official lecturers I heard only von Soden and Bultmann, and neither of them with real satisfaction. (Prof. Otto was the whole time laid aside with the illness which led up to his death in March.) I had hoped to hear Bultmann on *Formgeschichte,* but his subject for the semester was an exposition of the Fourth Gospel, which he dealt with in what seemed to me an excessively arbitrary fashion. Treating the gospel like a Gnostic jig-saw puzzle, he evinced no interest in the history of which the gospel is an *Umbildung* or in the historical Personality behind it all; his *religionsgeschichtliche* method allowed everything to be grist to his illustrative mill, from a Buddhist tale to an African proverb, and I never knew what was coming next (apart from *Wort* and *Glaube*), never felt he had given us a method of study which we could follow out for ourselves. Von Soden, who dealt with New Testament Theology in general, seemed much more penetrating and objective, but it was a hard, unsympathetic objectivity, and this, unless the criterion be right, can become as irrelevant as a flighty subjectivism. Von Soden is extremely critical in the technical sense; and it was a shock to me that, after he had said that Jesus did not think of Himself as the Messiah and did not possess a super-human conciousness, he added that this did not affect our faith, which was the faith of the Church and for which Jesus *was* the Messiah. "The religion of Jesus" may or may not be *passé* in this country, but a little of it would in many ways do Germany no harm: that is one's feeling after some months of Lutheran Paulinism from the pulpit and the lecture-stool.

The ways of National-Socialism naturally did not affect me directly, but its atmosphere was all around me and at times not the pleasantest to breathe. To get rid of rats in Germany is no doubt all to the good; but to fine every housewife £2 10s. 0d. if she cannot produce by a certain date the chemist's receipt for some rat-killer, whether she has rats in the house or not, or again to fine her £7 10s. 0d. if she does not go when she's told and where she's told for instruction in first aid remedies in case of air raids—well, it makes one feel "That's the way to make the soldiers march". The ceaseless propaganda reminds one of Dr. Johnson's remark, "Truth, Sir, is a cow which will yield such people no more milk; and so they are gone to milk the bull". At other times an Englishman living in Germany to-day is reminded that he comes from an older country—older in civilization, in Christianity, in unity, in freedom, in self-government, and then many of the present emphases appear as the crude and rather ugly exaggerations common in adolescence but rarely dangerous to other people. More important for him to observe is the underlying disposition of the people; and here I must confess that the impression formed on earlier visits was but strengthened. The word that hits them off as a people is *schwer* (heavy): they are *schwer* in their build, their gait, their food, their language, their humour, their buildings. Another word which applies is *dick* in both its senses (thick, fat): the significance of language must not be over-estimated, but compare their word for the plant we call maidenhair, *Frauenhaar,* with *chevelure de Vénus,* consider the preoccupation with feet implied in calling a glove a *Handschuh,* or take *Magensverstimmung* (indigestion) and the ubiquity of *Fleisch* (*Fleisch* for so many sorts of meat, *Sitzfleisch,*

Fleischwerdung, Auferstehung des Fleisches). This "thickness" or insensitivity appears in so many ways, in their practice of cutting their hair so short that it bristles like a pig's, for instance, or in breaking off a lecture with the bell instead of (where possible) at the end of a "piece", in their loud talking in public vehicles and their lack of self-consciousness generally. This last is peculiarly interesting. To a German *Selbstbewusstsein* means either conceit or self-consciousness in the sense of bashfulness; self-consciousness in the English sense of balancing consciousness of oneself and consciousness of the world around one in a delicate equilibrium I found constantly was a new idea to them. It is because it is new to them that their pre-eminent good quality of *Gründlichkeit* (thoroughness: how often one hears the word!) is so dangerous: the fate of Laud and Wentworth might teach them something here. Their fundamental need would seem, then, to be an external standard, a criterion against which to see themselves; that it is a chronic need is unhappily suggested by Goethe's admission of the *Formlosigkeit* (formlessness) of their style and by Coleridge's already accusing them of a certain "nimiety—toomuchness". How deeply it is needed in this century is shown by the relatively easy swing-over to the present *régime*, under which a bishop can produce a Nazi *John*, a student can tell a Swiss student he is a *Volksverräter* (a traitor to his people) simply because he is a Swiss, and a professor can announce in a course on Ethics that Germany has since 1933 had a new ethic, peculiar to herself, and he is not lecturing for foreigners. The impossibility of travel, the difficulty of obtaining books from abroad, the censorship of newspapers, make it increasingly hard for those to gain a criterion who want one, and the thickening of the people's heart would seem as palpable and as tragic as in the Old Testament. Individuals bewail their lot, but what are they among so many?

Such generalizations are too fatally easy: four and a half months in a country is just long enough to convince one that one knows nothing. Yet impressions, if taken in the right way, can be of value, and in so far as these criticisms are true of the *intelligentsia* they are probably not less true of the rest of the people; moreover, to stay in one place, though it means knowing fewer people, also means knowing those few more deeply. With this *caveat* (which is a large one) I think that what I have said is not without a modicum of objectivity.

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE IN JAPAN.

By Willard Price.

The fight for peace in Japan is mainly waged by Christians. At serious risk of being gaoled on a charge of obstructing government policy, the Christians have been standing staunchly for world brotherhood in the face of current war excitement.

Do not think for a moment that the members of Christian churches in Japan are not loyal to their country and Emperor. They are passionately so; but their loyalty takes a different turn because of their Christianity. They are not convinced that all other nations wish Japan ill. They have enough faith in the sense of fair play of their brothers overseas to believe that the peculiar problems of overcrowded Japan may be reasonably solved.

Not only the Christians, but the Japanese people as a whole, are peaceably inclined. That is obvious to anyone who lives among them. During four years' residence in Japan, I have never seen a fight, nor even a quarrel, nor have I heard an angry word spoken, except by foreigners. Dr. S. H. Wainwright, veteran missionary, college president and Christian publisher

in Japan for forty years, when asked to define the Japanese spirit, replied, *"Aisatsu"* (greetings, or courtesy). The Japanese are not, by character, trouble-hunters. They point with pride to the fact that, although the Chinese are continually at war among themselves and have been for decades, Japan has had no internal disturbance in sixty years.

Japan has a strong sense of peace, order, and efficiency. And it was just that sense which caused her to take bandit-ridden, disorderly, and inefficient Manchuria, in which Japanese rights had long been violated, by the scruff of the neck and shake it down into a state of peace, order, and efficiency.

But right there is where the difference of opinion comes in. The militarists maintain that war is a means to peace, and point to the new and orderly Manchukuo as proof. Many Japanese, and particularly the Christians, hold that the pacification and progress of Manchuria could have been peacefully obtained. We cannot tell which view is correct—but we can easily tell which view is Christian.

While many privately disapproved of the drastic measures of the army, the Christians were the only ones to speak out. From the National Christian Council, which represents all the Christian churches of Japan, came declarations, resolutions, and petitions filled with dangerously plain statements such as the following:

> "Deeply regretting the occurrence of the Manchurian incident. . ." "We cannot but feel a deep sense of self-reproach. . ." "Sincerely deplore Manchurian situation. Will exert ourselves for just and peaceful solution." "For ourselves and for the sins of our fellow nationals we earnestly offer our repentance before God." "We pledge ourselves to new endeavour in behalf of peace."

Imagine English churches declaring themselves so boldly for peace during the war to "make the world safe for democracy"! English and American churchmen waved the war-flag as fervidly as anyone. Is a more Christian Christianity growing up in the Far East?

Many Christian students are actively enrolled for peace. The details of an experience which two such students had with the police were related to me. The two boys were detained overnight. Sleeping, or trying to sleep, on the *tatami* (straw slabs) of a Japanese floor without adequate mattresses is not conducive to courage. In the morning Taro said,

"For five sen I'd give in. Anything to get out of here!"

"That goes for me too", grumbled Saito.

But neither of them meant it. As they ate a meagre breakfast of rice and bean soup, their spirits went up. When they were released from their cell and brought into a dingy office to face three grim inspectors they were quite ready for the third degree that might be in store for them.

There were the usual questions as to identity. Then:

"Is it true that you put up anti-war posters in the halls of your college?"

"Yes."

"And you made speeches against militarism before the student body?"

"Yes."

"Are you communists?"

"No."

"But you presume to criticize the policy of your Government?"

"We do."

"You realize that you are guilty of disloyalty?"

"We realize nothing of the kind. We are loyal to what we consider the best interests of Japan!"

"And just what do you think to be the best interests of Japan?"

"Japan must have room. Her population is increasing at the rate of a million a year. She is locked up in these small islands. She must expand. Other nations are unfair in shutting out Japanese. If we cannot emigrate then we must support ourselves by industries, and sell goods to the world. But the world is erecting high tariffs against our goods. And our industries need raw materials that we do not have in Japan—but can get in Manchuria. Japan needs room, willing customers, and raw materials."

Silence. The inspectors were plainly puzzled. It was as if their own choicest arguments had all been taken out of their mouths.

"Sa!" finally breathed the chief behind the desk. "But if you believe all this, how can you oppose militarism? Can these things be accomplished without war?"

"We are Christians, inspector. We are followers of the Prince of Peace. Christ conquered the world not by force, but by peace. We love Japan—would willingly give our lives for her. But we believe that war ruins both the victor and the vanquished—and that the only way Japan can hope to win what is justly due her is by peaceful means."

The chief exchanged glances with his associates. "These are fools", the glances said. "But good fools. Loyal fools. Suppose we let them go." And, with an admonition, they were released.

Not all such cases end so happily. There have been instances of dismissal from school, loss of position, illness, and suicide.

There are several vigorous peace organizations of Christians in Japan. The Fellowhip of Reconciliation merits frequent interference by the police. Although Japan has resigned from the League, the League of Nations Association continues its work under the name of the International League. The World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches educates Sunday School children in the knowledge that not all foreigners are monsters. Also it holds meetings of prayer and protest, the handbill for one such meeting declaring, "The emergency is not the time for Christians to be silent". At Tokyo's Friendship House students from many nations fraternize. A Student Exchange arrangement brought three fine Chinese students for a tour of Japan's universities to explain China's position, and took Japanese students to China on a similar mission. The Women's Peace Association holds a competition in all girls' high schools for prize essays on peace, to be read on their annual peace day in May.

Even more significant than the work of organizations is the work of individuals. It is easier to fight under the protection of an organization than to fight alone. Have Japanese Christians personal courage? Well, let us consider a few lone warriors.

A young man named Takahashi gave up his job as college librarian because the college required military drill. He underwent great privation. He lived with the unemployed of Tokyo, becoming a sort of mayor of their tent city, ministering to them and loved by all. A Tokyo theatre staged a play concerning him, and he became famous overnight as a social worker and dramatic hero. Money came from well-wishers. He used it, not for himself, but world peace. He started an "International Children's Unity Club" through which thousands of children of the West exchanged friendly letters with Japanese children, and learned that people on the other side of the world were just as human as they were. He printed a little paper, *Seeds of Peace,* and a book, *Peace and the Child.* He later lived in a small house called "Jonah's hut" in Toyohiko Kagawa's back yard. Despite the protests of friends, he starved himself, devoting every possible cent to his peace work. His sacrificial living brought understanding to many, but

brought death to him. A victim of undernourishment and overwork, he left the words, "I die to atone for Japanese militarism. I die to become a seed of peace".

An opium and cigarette fiend, Kikuchi by name, was saved by Christianity. He became secretary of the Anti-Opium League. At the time of the Manchurian trouble he printed a pamphlet giving facts which the authorities did not wish to have published. He was arrested, detained for a month, put several times through the third degree, and came out in bad nervous condition. He found that his wife, who disagreed with his views, had deserted him, taking their son with her. His nervous system, weakened by his past addiction to drugs and now by his new misfortunes, broke down, and he took his own life.

Kagawa declares himself ready to go to prison if necessary. He has devoted himself to the task of putting his affairs in order so that his possible imprisonment will not cause suffering to the thousands of needy for whom he is responsible. He forecasts that Christianity in Japan is about to enter a period of persecution, and declares himself ready to endure his share.

A young Quaker has been preaching peace so vigorously during his military training that his army term has been shortened because he is considered an undesirable element in the barracks!

A Christian statesman in the Diet, Ozaki, has seriously endangered himself by the heretical statement that loyalty to the nation should be transcended by loyalty to God. To us, this would not seem an inflammatory utterance—but it must be remembered that in Japan the Emperor is regarded as divine, and no other deity may take precedence over him.

The *Christian Graphic,* a monthly published by Christian Japanese and missionaries, has been suppressed because of articles condemning resort to war as barbaric and foolish, and the American missionary who edited it is now exiled from Japan.

The brilliant Mrs. Kohra, graduate of Columbia University and head of the department of psychology in the Japan Women's University, took a strong stand for peace, knowing it would mean the loss of her position—and it did.

These are but a few examples out of many. Of course all the Christians of Japan are too small a minority to control Government policy. But they can put themselves on record for peace. And as for persecution, some Christian leaders, far from fearing it, even hope that it may develop. For they know that Christianity has always thrived on persecution. Even now, according to Dr. Tagawa, President of Meiji College, "because of the pressure of international crises, the Japanese people are turning to Christianity". The steady growth of Christian influence in Japan is the most hopeful sign for peace in the Orient in years to come.

The deserved success of the two volumes of *Contemporary American Theology* has led the Editor, Mr. Vergilius Ferm, to cast a wider net. In *Religion in Transition* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) scholars as wide apart—theologically as well as geographically—as S. Radhakrishnan, C. F. Andrews, G. A. Coe, Alfred Loisy, J. H. Leuba, and E. D. Starbuck describe the way in which they have travelled in their thinking. The collection makes a volume well worth reading. To Prof. Coe's notable contribution reference is made in the Editorial.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

Recently I took some pains to obtain from a group of intelligent and critical young men and women a statement as to how they regard institutional religion. It is interesting to observe that in most cases they do not directly raise intellectual difficulties, they do not advance a scepticism as to fundamental doctrinal claims. The two letters which I now quote are, I think, fairly representative of the general answers which I received. "I am afraid", writes the first of my friends, "that it is mainly the personnel of the Church which puts me off. The regular orthodox Christians seem to be the least alive of any section of society. They are just well-meaning, conventional people, who find satisfaction in religious worship. They avoid the people who are actively facing up to vital questions, they aren't interested in vital questions. They are absorbed in their own cult. I am thinking not only of the religious laity, but of the clergy and ministers of religious bodies. They are the last people to whom I would turn in any moral or business or social trouble. They don't rub shoulders enough with the real world to be able to be of help. One has only to listen to the ordinary sermon to realize the kind of mind which the Church produces . . . I know this may seem horribly supercilious. But I think it is a reasonable ground for my distrust of orthodoxy. The type of mind which it attracts into its ministry, the type of lay mind to which it appeals must, after all, be a fair test. If the mind which it produces hasn't much practical or intellectual value, if the Churches are exclusively confined to conventional people, there must be something wrong with the system".

Kenneth Ingram, *Christianity—Right or Left?*

Our fathers preferred to interpret facts in terms of ideas: our own tendency is to interpret ideas in terms of facts. The Victorians, realizing, for instance, that the greatest happiness accorded to man is that provided by a happy marriage, endeavoured to pretend that all their marriages were happy. We, for our part, admitting the fact that no feat of intelligence and character is so exacting as that required of two people who desire to live permanently together on a basis of amity, are obsessed by the problem of how to render the basic facts of cohabitation simpler and more reasonable, in order that unhappy marriages may less frequently result. The Victorians would have considered it "painful" or "unpleasant" were one to point out that only four marriages out of every ten are anything but forced servitudes. We ourselves start from this very assumption and try to build from it a theory of more sensible relations between the sexes. Of all forms of arrant untruthfulness Victorian optimism appears to me to have been the most cowardly and the most damaging.

Harold Nicolson, *Small Talk.*

The clergy are all trained in the psychology of religion, and it is recognized that the most important part of their duties is giving individual advice and help to those who are in trouble about their souls, and who wish to overcome their special temptations. In this work of individual guidance I should call the interviews consultations, not confessions. Some of the clergy would win reputations as consulting physicians, and theirs would be a full-time job; but in many villages the parson would also follow some secular calling. He might be the schoolmaster or parish doctor.

Dr. Inge's "My Utopia" in *A Rustic Moralist.*

To this changed outlook education has to adjust itself. Religion and morality have not ceased, and cannot cease, to have their place in education, as in life; but it can no longer be in the form of an institutional religion and a conventional morality which enshrine the ideas and language of another age. If they are to meet our needs they must embody values that are at once recognized as universal and found in personal experience. To help to establish such a basis for conduct is the most vital part of the work of education.

J. H. Badley, *A Schoolmaster's Testament.*

The religious form of legalistic ethics is to be found in pharisaism. It is a mistake to imagine, as many Christians do, that Pharisees were morally and religiously on a low level and to use the word almost as a term of abuse. On the contrary, pharisaism was the highest point reached by the Jews in their moral and religious life. And, indeed, starting from the hard-set ground of the Old Testament religion of the law it was impossible to rise higher. But it was this pure and lofty form of Judaism that Christ denounced. The thing that impresses one most in reading the Gospel is the rebellion against pharisaism, the denunciation of its falsity as compared with the New Testament truth. This means the denunciation of legalistic morality, of the idea of justification by the law, and of complacent self-righteousness. The Gospel puts sinners and publicans above the Pharisees, the unclean above the clean, those who have not fulfilled the law above those who have fulfilled it, the last above the first, the perishing above the saved, "the wicked" above "the good". This is the paradox of Christian morality which the Christians have found it hard to understand and accept . . . . Pharisaism, *i.e.,* the ethics of law, is mercilessly condemned in the Gospel because its adherents do not need the Saviour and salvation as sinners and publicans need it, because if the final religious and moral truth were on the side of the Pharisees redemption would be unnecessary. Pharisaism means rejection of the Redeemer and redemption and the belief that salvation is to be found by fulfilling the moral law. But in truth salvation means rising above the distinction between good and evil which is the result of the Fall, *i.e.,* rising above the law engendered by that distinction. It means entering the Kingdom of Heaven, which is certainly not the Kingdom of the law or of the good as it exists on this side of the distinction.

Nicholas Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man.*

Floodlighting is eminently characteristic of the age. Everything must be seen without shadow, and the exaggerated brilliance of our wonderful lighting arrangements in itself gives us pleasure. For one person who can see the surpassing beauty of the towers of Westminster illumined by the fitful light of the moon, ten thousand will stand and stare open-mouthed at the Abbey pile theatrically and artificially bathed in a garish blaze of gas or electricity. But when blatancy reigns it is a mistake to suppose that the delicate network of the subtleties of life is destroyed. It is not. It is for ever woven into the texture of life, and no gaudy extravagances can obliterate it.

Lord Ponsonby, *Life Here and Now.*

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.)

Grey of Fallodon. By G. M. TREVELYAN. Longmans. 16s.

The house of Trevelyan will have no need to fear when biographers are brought to judgment. Trevelyan's *Macaulay* has not been deposed from its place among the first twelve English biographies, and this life of Edward Grey will assuredly rank not far from it. Prof. Trevelyan's gifts as historian—sound and impartial judgment, right perspective, and a wide background of knowledge—are wedded to a perspicuous English style which invariably makes his books a delight to read. There was every reason to expect that this biography would be successful, and the reader will not be disappointed.

Edward Grey wrote his own epitaph in a letter to his wife about his interview with Paul Cambon on 1st February, 1906, a letter which she never read: "I do not know that I did well, but I did honestly". Sometimes Grey's admirers, among whom we are to be counted, have felt qualms about his committal of Britain to the support of France without the knowledge of Parliament. Prof. Trevelyan makes an adequate defence on the point, so important that it must be quoted in full:

> For the reasons given above, the main principles of Grey's policy were these—Entente but not Alliance with France and Russia, accompanied by constant efforts to achieve more friendly relations with Germany. The policy was right, but this does not prove that he was wise in every step that he took to give it effect: such will not be the contention of this book. There has, however, been a tendency, even in England, to minimize the general rightness of his policy, by laying continual stress on certain important details in which he is said to have erred. In retrospective criticism, people forget the appalling danger of the situation with which he had to deal from 1906 onwards, though the actual course of the war surely made it manifest in the event; they forget the limitations on his action due to conditions at home; and they fail to make allowance for the great difficulties of an English Minister, called on to answer publicly for his actions in Parliament, dealing with despotic governments that could keep their own secrets. House of Commons conditions render it impossible for even so honest and frank a Foreign Minister as Grey to be always frank and always therefore completely honest.

The conspicuous honesty and integrity of the man were equalled only by his sense of duty and by his bravery. No man longed more for a life far from the madding crowd, among birds and trees, squirrels and streams; only a sense of "call" as insistent as that to the vocation to the pastoral office kept him in politics; only a courage far above the normal enabled him to carry on when cruel blows fell on him in swift succession.

> As the years went on, it became a part of Edward Grey's heavy fate that every person with whom he desired to make a home for life

was doomed to die, and that every habitation in which he loved to dwell was burnt to the ground.

Prof. Trevelyan finds compensation for Grey's growing blindness in the relief it brought from the old struggle between his private desires and his sense of public duty, but only those who have shared his intense love of nature can imagine what it was like to be deprived of the sight of the heather and the hills, the birds and flowers, and to have to write:

> My sense of smell is nearly gone and my eyesight is very feeble and no use in watching birds.

This for the man who had written twenty years before:

> I love it all and wish I was going to stay in it quietly till the leaves come. A painless and sane old age in which to sit still and watch would be the greatest blessing of life: it seems too rare and great for me to hope for. I have seen little this winter: the two library window squirrels have become so tame that they will come into the room and take nuts and go about the floor close to us.

Let anyone read the letter on p. 148 in which Grey describes his loneliness after the tragic death of his wife, and they will have no doubts of the calibre of the man. Or take the three very different entries on one page:

> I don't think there will be war at present, but it will be difficult to keep the peace of Europe for another five years.
>
> I like what you say of the unchangingness of Ella Pease and her mother: there is something spiritually antiseptic in good Quakerism.
>
> I was thinking the other day what a secure possession the past is. The happiness and beauty that it had cannot now be spoilt or impaired: having had it one cannot be pessimistic either about this life or another.

Or this written from his beloved cottage at Itchen Abbas during the War:

> The beauty has been overwhelming; pear and apple blossom overlapped, and the profusion and splendour were more than human capacity could appreciate. I used to feel at this season of the year a sense of waste because I could not enjoy at once all that was spread abroad; till one day the overwhelming egotism of looking at it from this limited human point of view occurred to me, and I thought that God might be contemplating it all. Then I ceased to be oppressed by the sense of waste. The beauty of the season makes the contrast of man-made war more horrible and poignant; on the other hand it gives comfort and support. The sight of all this beauty and the feeling of response to it in oneself gives assurance that God rules in the Universe, and that evil cannot prevail. It is the same feeling expressed in the Bible and attributed to Noah when he saw the rainbow after the floods.

Prof. Trevelyan has made good use, not only of printed documents, but of manuscripts which have not yet seen the light, and his book will be of constant use to students of international politics.

His words about Mr. Lloyd George are few but weighty:

> Mr. Lloyd George's great gifts are not strictly historical. He lives so keenly in the present that he cannot recall his own past, as in his attitude to this question of war in July, 1914 . . . Mr. Lloyd George, after opposing participation in the war, at the last moment became fired with a generous enthusiasm for Belgium. No one need blame him for being temperamental, for he has the qualities of his defects. But his retrospective creation of situations that never existed,

in order to cast blame on others, is unworthy of the great part he has played in the world's affairs.

He summarizes Grey's policy in masterly fashion, and concludes:

> He had failed in his first object, to preserve peace. But he was destined to succeed in his second object, to prevent the establishment of German military rule over Europe. Thanks to him, Britain as a united country entered the war just in time to save France from immediate conquest, from which she could never have risen again, and which must have been speedily followed by our own ruin.

Grey was not at Versailles. Would he had been! The history of Europe might then have been different, but, as he said: "I am glad I am not there: they are out for loot". No higher praise could be given to Prof. Trevelyan than to say he has given us a biography not unworthy of his subject, who will long remain as a supreme example of the upright and disinterested statesmen Britain has from time to time produced.

EDITOR.

A GREAT CONGREGATIONALIST: R. F. HORTON OF HAMPSTEAD

Robert Forman Horton. By ALBERT PEEL and J. A. R. MARRIOTT. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

I opened this biography of R. F. Horton with some fear for the difficult task which Dr. Peel had undertaken: there were pitfalls on the right and on the left; to present Horton uncritically as the paragon among ministers and the complete saint; or else, from the material Horton himself provides in his *Autobiography* and diaries, to see him as an egotist, self-conscious, introspective, and swept along on emotional currents which he never stemmed. Either of these accounts would have had truth in them, for, as Mr. Basil Martin pointed out long ago, Horton was two men; but it would have been truth mixed with much error. Horton was neither of these things, though he was something of both. In the result Dr. Peel and Sir John Marriott (who has written the very valuable chapters on Horton's Shrewsbury life and his Oxford days) have hit the Aristotelian mean, and they show us a man with many elements of greatness in him, but not without human frailties. The book becomes a fascinating character study, and is a first-rate biography. In all that goes to the judgment of Horton's character the facts are given in Horton's own words, taken from his diaries and published works. There is no adulation; nothing of the kind of eulogy which belongs to the obituary notice rather than to biography. Dr. Peel's verdict is always generous, and on nearly all points seems to me true. He succeeds in leaving the impression of Horton's vivid and charming personality, and especially an impression of his spiritual pre-eminence.

In its total effect Horton's life was a "mystical quest of Christ"; prayer was to him "the open secret". Dr. Peel is right in making this the subject of a central chapter. I always thought of Horton as similar in spirit to that most lovable of Congregational ministers, Arnold Thomas of Bristol; and only the other day I came across some of Horton's own words in which he says that he had been helped by what Arnold Thomas was, more than he had been helped by any other minister. This points to a secret the two men had in common, that vast spiritual background which in each of them was the true reason for their power. Much has always been made of Horton's culture: well, leave it at that; Oxford is a great

school, though it never got the last remnant of "Philistinism" out of R. F. Horton! The chapters written by Sir John Marriott will bring home to the reader how great were the intellectual talents which Horton devoted to the ministry. But it was not this aura of "sweetness and light", or at least it was not this culture taken by itself, that made Horton's strength; it was the combination of it with the mystical aim of his life; and where these went together Horton could do almost anything. The story of Lyndhurst Road, as Dr. Peel tells it, is the wonderful witness to this alliance of gifts.

But did he keep them together? This is a question which this biography is bound to raise; and in particular with reference to Horton's preaching. There is no doubt that Horton at his best and in his prime could be a very great preacher indeed; often in reading his sermons there are passages which remind you of the great French preachers, the same rush of passion, the same rhetorical appeal. But what Horton so often lacked was a reining in of himself; that something which gave to Newman's sermons at St. Mary's simplicity, and also an intellectual edge like a sharpened sword; Horton too easily let his emotions run away with him, and sometimes they lost him in the quicksands. This is why, with all his brilliance and with such enthralling beauty of spiritual purpose, his work nevertheless may not prove to have the lasting power which the greatest preaching always possesses.

The same over-emphasis of the emotional side of his character probably accounts for some things in this biography very difficult to understand, but which Dr. Peel touches on with the utmost sympathy. First of all there is the friendship described by Horton himself in his *Autobiography,* to which he traces what is best in his life. This is not ground for blundering critics, and Dr. Peel's treatment of it is perfect in its sensitiveness. Then there is the fuss made about the article Mr. Basil Martin wrote in 1893; surely a fair and generous article enough, unless we are to be immune from all breath of criticism. And there are Horton's wailings against himself in his diaries, his despondency, and at the end his lamentations that he is fallen out of demand. These are troubling things, and one almost wishes that the diaries had remained private. We are all mortal men. Perhaps Horton would have been the better for a little more of the rough and tumble criticism and the good-humoured chaff which men mete out so gloriously to one another in the common room.

What then was R. F. Horton, as Dr. Peel represents him? To begin with, he was a good man. The grace of his character, and the fervour of his evangelical faith, are known in all the churches. He was also a man who won supremely the affection and confidence of his own people, and of his brethren throughout the ministry. He was fearless in his love of truth; fearless in his loyalty to principle. And, not least, he was a great Nonconformist, with the traditions of an older Independency firm in his heart; and a belief, from which he never departed, that the Church is the body of believing souls made one in Christ. He will be remembered as one of the great Congregationalists. His name will come to be ranked among the Congregational fathers. I have heard it said that he would have gone further if he had conformed. But he was not of that school. The glory would have departed. As it is, his name is written on our hearts.

In this book Dr. Peel has made a permanent addition to Christian biography and Congregational history. Somehow I wished the last chapter, which is by Sir John Marriott, had been different. There seemed no need to say that Horton preached his farewell sermons to a half-empty church; and following on Dr. Peel's estimate of "Horton, the Man", the

chapter is a little flat. The book might well have ended with Dr. Peel's quotation from "Rugby Chapel". However, these are small matters: the whole book is a very worthy tribute to Horton's life and work.

A. T. S. James.

The Prophetic Consciousness. Abraham Heschel: *Die Prophetie*: pp. vi + 195. Kraków: im Verlag der Polnischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: in Deutschland zu beziehen durch den Erich Reiss Verlag, Berlin: 1936.

One of the great and welcome changes in the continental study of the Old Testament is an increased attention to its religious and theological values. Many writers are now no longer content to analyse and describe its human elements, but seek to combine with these a fuller recognition of their divine significance. The book under notice is an example of this healthy reaction to a position always more represented in this country. The prophetic consciousness of Israel, which is the subject of the book, is admittedly the supreme example, the ultimate and testing case, of the meeting of God and man in divine revelation. How is the contact established? The answer of the book is that it consists essentially in a human "sympathy" with the "pathos" or emotion of God. The prophet so far shares in the whole personal relation of God to His people and the world, and by this fellowship in experience the mind and heart of God are made known to him. Such a position, of course, involves the complete rejection of the doctrine of divine impassibility, which we owe to Greek thought; this is all to the good. The writer also rejects (perhaps too absolutely) any connexion of the great prophets of Israel with the earlier "ecstatic" *Nebi'im*. He is concerned to show the conscious "mutuality" of the relation between God and the prophet, and here he seems wholly right in his emphasis. It might be claimed that, in all experience of fellowship with God, there is the same "mutuality" in its own degree. We bring our human purpose to God in the faith that it is His also, a conviction that carries us over the bad places where "the broken vow and the frequent fall" have robbed us of our own strength and thrown us the more on God's. This at least seems the direction in which the author's argument (at times rather obscure and involving over-much repetition) seems to point. He rightly urges that the prophetic consciousness was a unity, and only as such a unity can it be understood. The book well deserves careful study. It would have gained by a fuller recognition of those features of Hebrew psychology which distinguish it from our own.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

The Third Morality. By Gerald Heard. Cassell. 10s. 6d.

The idea of a third morality suggests that there have been two previous moralities and that they have been found wanting. This is Mr. Heard's contention in a very lively and interesting book. He believes that ethics depend upon cosmology, or, in other words, that the actions of an individual or of nations are regulated by the view taken of the universe and of human life. Two cosmologies have had their day and ceased to be. Another and a better one is in process of formation and is at once indicating the need for and laying down the lines of a new ethical system. The two previous cosmologies Mr. Heard calls the anthropomorphic and the mechanomorphic. The first, with its belief in a personal deity and in an ethic of obedience and submission, is, Mr. Heard considers, played out. The second, with its surely mechanistic view of the universe, makes ethics really

impossible and is falling by its own weight. Hence the necessity for a new cosmology and a third morality.

Mr. Heard is a shrewd diagnostician, but, like many of his kind, he is not so good when it comes to suggesting remedies. Most of his readers will follow with a considerable amount of agreement his discussion of the sick condition of modern civilization, but we should imagine they will also be agreed that his suggestions for treating it are neither as clear nor as novel as he seems to think. The new cosmology is as yet only in process of formation. It is based on a provisional scheme which sees the universe as the expression of mind, and man's mind or consciousness as representative of this universal mind. "Our mind and the universal mind think in the same manner." Hence, Mr. Heard argues,

> our task throughout life, the basis of our morality, the principle of all ethics must be to render as clear our apprehension of this profound united common life as is our apprehension of our material individual life.

From this co-ordinating outlook there follows a purposive way of living which seeks to keep the individual in harmony with this universal mind, the evidences of which he finds all around him and in himself. The individual is part of a general life and his conduct will be dictated by his recognition of this fact. He realizes that the "universe is alive and that every creature, himself included, is part of that life". The practical result of this will be the kind of reverence for life of which Dr. Schweitzer is so keen an advocate, and an ethic of human relations and of the relations between mind and the animal world that is partly Christian, partly Buddhist.

For the life based on this ethic man must train himself, and the latter part of Mr. Heard's book is occupied with the subject of training, physical, mental, and psychological. It is all very interesting and quite good, but it leaves the impression of the reader's mind that we have here simply the development of the Christian ethic without any of the sanctions on which it depends. It is the old story of humanism which urges man to the futile business of lifting himself by his own belt. It is true that certain forms of one time anthropomorphism are discredited, but how can man think in any other than anthropomorphic terms? The sanctions on which the morality of anthropomorphism depended may no longer hold good, but if the ethic of the new cosmology is to prove as potent as that of the old it will need to recover something, at any rate, of its ancient sanctions.

W. B. Selbie.

The Doctrine of the Work of Christ. By Sydney Cave, D.D. University of London Press. 6s.

By writing this book Dr. Cave has rendered a very great service to theological students, who will find in it a most admirable textbook covering the particular field of study in a masterly and comprehensive manner. But he has done much more than this—he has written a book of great interest, not only to the theological student preparing for an examination, but to all who in any way are concerned with theology. There is a definitely individual touch about the treatment—we feel, as we read, that the author has been over the ground for himself and is taking his own line.

The writing of a history of the subject in so relatively small a compass is made possible by a concentration on the leading thinkers, whose views are fully and adequately presented. The account of Schleiermacher, for example, is admirable; and it is a most difficult thing to do justice to him in a few pages. Athanasius, Anselm, Calvin, Ritschl, and the rest all are

dealt with equally well—the proportion is just and the exposition is clear and reliable. The book begins with the *N.T.* and comes down to Barth and Brunner, including the Patristic and Medieval theology, and the theology of Protestantism old and new, both on the European Continent and in England and America.

Dr. Cave has been influenced in his presentation by Aulén's notable book, *Christus Victor,* which distinguishes three principal theories of the Atonement—Aulén calls them the classical, the Latin, and the moral theories. By the first is meant the patristic doctrine that Christ by His Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection has vanquished sin and the devil—the second comprises generally all the varieties of satisfaction-theory, Anselmic, orthodox Protestant, and Grotian—the third is the theory of Abelard and his modern followers, who view the Atonement as a manifestation of the Divine Love in the Cross that kindles an answering love in the hearts of men. Aulén claimed that the patristic theory combined the merits of the other two doctrines while avoiding their defects—it did not, like the Latin theory, envisage a working of man upon God, but rather a movement from God upon man; yet it was not so subjective as Abelard's doctrine, but recognized "a finished work" performed by Christ in His victory over the forces of evil.

Dr. Cave thinks that a true theory of the Atonement must synthesize the truth in all three theories; but of the three he is furthest from the satisfaction-theory, he comes nearer to the moral theory, but finally gives the palm to the patristic doctrine in a modernized form. He writes:

> Men speak to-day of the Cross that lies always on the heart of God, but if we so speak we have to do so as those who see in the Cross the symbol not of suffering only but of triumph. Christ's work for men was not only a revelation of God's love. It was that love in decisive and victorious action.

Thus the truth expressed in the penal theory can only be preserved when Christ's suffering is taken as a stage in His victory; while again victory is more than revelation, it is love in decisive action.

The question which I am inclined to ask here is whether the distinction between revelation and action is really sound. Perhaps I may be allowed to quote a couple of sentences from my Dale Lectures on the Atonement:

> When we speak of revelation in this connexion, it is not of a doctrine that we should think, but of love active, love enduring, suffering, dying. We should think of the Divine initiative in the Cross—that and nothing less is what is meant.

For me revelation and action are one and the same thing. Let us ask, how does Christ act and on what or whom does He act? He does not literally struggle with the devil; neither does He act upon God, but for God; again He does not act upon "sin" in the abstract. Surely that on which He acts is sinful men, and He acts by melting their hard hearts, and by moving them to penitence and trust. His work is finished in that He died once for all—Love could do no more. In another sense His work is never finished, as long as a single sinner remains to be saved.

To sum up: I only differ from Dr. Cave to the extent that I should interpret the patristic theory by means of Abelard's, and not *vice versa.*

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Philosophy of Relativity. By A. P. USHENKO. Allen & Unwin. 8s. 6d.

The controversy between Platonism and Aristotelianism about the nature of universals and their relation to individuals is classic in the history

of philosophy. Plato held that universals alone were real, while the individuals that exemplify them were no more than shadowy copies of them in the dubious medium of our sense-perception. Aristotle stoutly maintained, on the other hand, that reality appertained to individuals, but he had nevertheless to admit that universals had a measure of reality: if individuals were "essences", universals were "secondary essences".

This ancient controversy is repeated in a new form in Prof. Ushenko's *Philosophy of Relativity*. The *rôle* once played by Plato's universals is here taken by "substances": that taken by Aristotle's individuals is played by "events". Just as Aristotle repudiated the Platonic doctrine of universals in favour of individual things, Ushenko repudiates the classical modern philosophy which uses substance as its primary category; and just as Aristotle proposed to begin the study of the universe from the basis of the existence of individual things, so Ushenko undertakes to start from events as the prime elements beyond which analysis cannot go. We may say that the whole controversy has been transferred one stage further. Aristotle dismissed Plato's universals in favour of individual things; Ushenko dismisses things in favour of single events, thus still further atomizing nature. But just as Aristotle in the end had to concede some reality to universals, without which in fact he could not explain individual things, so Ushenko is constrained to grant a place in his scheme to what we mean by the *thing*. This he does by a distinction between events and facts. Events are actualities. Facts are potentalities. An event is an absolutely indivisible single happening. A fact is a characteristic or set of characteristics manifested in the event, and which may be manifested in other events. Thus each event is in itself alone single and different from any other event, as one postage stamp is different from any other. But a common characteristic or set of characteristics may be exhibited in a series of different events, as the same pattern may be imprinted on a number of separate stamps.

Every event, then, gathers one or more characteristics into itself: as such it is a single experience, which may be conscious or unconscious. In order to be perceived by other events, it must further occupy a block of space-time, from which it becomes the source of various perceptions, thus entering into different perspective views of the universe. Space-time, therefore, is also of the nature of a fact: it is a general potentiality of events, and as such is a category, required for the description of the universe, equally with those of "characteristic" and "event".

Every perception, again, as such is an event, single and sole. The problem for this description of the universe, in which atomistic source-events are perceived by atomistic perception-events, is therefore how and where continuity is to be got into the picture. Prof. Ushenko brings in memory, as a kind of *deus ex machina*. Somehow, besides perception-events there are memory-images; and we fail sufficiently to distinguish between them, as happens in the well-known case where a burning torch is whirled through the air and we seem to perceive a circle of light—the memory images blurring into the actual perceptions, and *vice versa*. Art, utilizing memory, is the great means of representing facts which lie beyond the momentary perception: in this way we arrive at a picture of the past, which is thus made to live eternally, free from the bondage of the time-order.

It does not seem that this kind of philosophy carries us very far. Reality is analysed into events; and then only by what appears like a sleight of hand is any sort of continuity got back into the universe. One is reminded of the familiar jingle:

Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall,
Humpty Dumpty had a great fall:
All the king's horses and all the king's men
Couldn't put Humpty Dumpty together again.

The merit of the *Philosophy of Relativity* is that it reviews and will introduce the reader to a number of modern tentative efforts (by Whitehead, Russell, *etc.*) at describing a universe which is being daily transformed before our eyes by the advance of modern physics; but it does not appear that these efforts have as yet attained any great degree of success.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Prayers of The Apostle Paul. By JOHN A. BAIN, M.A., D.D. Lutterworth Press. 2s. 6d.

The Power of God. By DR. KARL HEIM, translated by L. M. STALKER. Lutterworth Press. 5s.

The Reformation and its Bearing on some Modern Problems. Lutterworth Press. 1s. 6d.

There are many books on St. Paul and many ways of interpreting his meaning. Dr. Bain seeks to enter into his secret through a study of his prayers. We hope his book will have the success it deserves. Many find it hard to distinguish in St. Paul's words the treasure of the Gospel from the earthen vessel in which it was contained; in consequence they feel that his teaching has lost its value for modern men. We believe that they are wrong in this, and that his teaching is still the classic expression of the Gospel. But that teaching can only be fully understood by those who have become familiar with the ideas and aspirations of his age, and for those who have no opportunity of such study his theology must thus remain in part unintelligible. But Paul's religion can be understood by all who share his faith, and that religion finds full expression in his prayers. Dr. Bain's clear, concise studies of Paul's prayers should remove many perplexities, and help his readers not only to understand but to share in Paul's profound experience. This book is very simply written, but its simplicity is of the kind which comes from much thought and study.

We have many books of Karl Heim on our shelves, and to his writings we owe much. We could not claim that most of them make easy reading. But this volume of sermons, *The Power of God,* shows that when addressing a popular audience he can speak so that he can be understood by any. Now that we have read this book, we can readily believe what Professor Dickie tells us in his preface that peasants as well as students flock to hear him preach. It is only rarely that Heim refers explicitly to the special circumstances of the German Church. But, although he preaches the eternal Gospel and leaves undiscussed the politics of Church and State, throughout he relates that Gospel to the fears and hopes of modern Germany, and so preaches that we in England can learn much from his preaching. Generally sermons, though they may be good to hear, are bad to read, but these fresh and vivid sermons are of the greatest interest. How different would our churches be if all called to preach could face the needs of our age with Heim's immovable faith, and with the same poignant simplicity relate the Gospel to the actual needs of men.

The Reformation and its Bearing on some Modern Problems reproduces the papers read at this year's Islington Clerical Conference. We Free Churchmen who are unashamedly in Luther's debt find it hard to forgive the confident ignorance with which some Anglican scholars speak of the great Reformer. It is refreshing to read a book by Anglican writers

concerned to understand and not to attack the Reformation. We hope that our Free Church leaders will not be content, in deference to Anglo-Catholic prejudices, to restrict the celebration of the Fourth Centenary of the Reformation to the commemoration of the open English Bible. We cannot afford to forget the great contribution to religion made by Luther's rediscovery of God's free grace in Christ. These papers show how living still are the issues which the Reformation raised. We hope this little book will be very widely read, and that our own Union at one of its meetings will produce a volume of papers on the Reformation as fresh and pertinent as these.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Romanism and the Gospel. By C. ANDERSON SCOTT, D.D. Church of Scotland Committee on Publications. 2s. 6d.

This beautifully-printed little volume of about 240 pp. is a vigorous *Auseinandersetzung* with the Church of Rome. After an introduction, there come first four chapters dealing with what Dr. Scott regards as the head and front of Catholicism's offending—the conversion of a religion of salvation by faith into a religion of salvation by works. This declension is traced back to changes begun immediately after the close of the *N.T.* period. Then follow short chapters dealing successively with the Virgin Mary, the Eucharist, the Mass, Purgatory and Indulgences, Relics and Miracles, the Roman Church as an institution, Scripture and Tradition, Catholic morals, *etc.* The points against the Roman case under each of these headings are very tellingly made, though the section on Scripture would have been improved by more adequate reference to the work of Biblical criticism, which, except on relatively minor issues, Rome steadily rejects. The whole work is suffused by a warmth of conviction which gives power to the argumentation, while never betraying the author into an ill-tempered expression.

My chief criticism would be directed against what I fear Dr. Scott would regard as the chief plank in his platform—I mean, his eager desire (shared by so many ardent Protestants) to establish and emphasize the incompatibility of Paul's version of salvation as resting on faith, with any insistence on the legal side of the Christian message. In my judgment, he immensely overrates the incongruity of the two. I have no space here to argue the matter out: but I must needs offer the following observations. The legal principle was not first introduced into Christianity in the sub-apostolic age; and in the *N.T.* it is not reflected only in *James,* which Dr. Scott is quite prepared to regard, with Luther, as "an epistle of straw". It is certainly found in the teaching of Jesus: consider the number of passages in which He uses the Aramaic equivalent of the Greek word μισθός ("pay", "reward"): these passages occur, not only in *Matt.* (which is sometimes *over*-suspected of Judaistic perversions—moreover, a belief is not necessarily erroneous because it is Jewish), but in *Mk.,* yes and in "Q" also! Nay more, if Dr. Scott's antithesis is to be pressed as he presses it, we shall have to set even Paul against Paul: look, for instance, at passages like *Gal.* 6^{7}, *I Cor.* 7^{19}, *Rom.* 2^{13}. Incidentally, in dealing (p. 57) with the notion of man as God's servant or slave, Dr. Scott does not observe how frequently Paul calls himself "a *slave* of Jesus Christ". And I find it exceedingly hard to harmonize the oft-repeated denial that our Lord was a legislator with His own emphatic words in *Lk.* 6^{47-49}=*Mt.* 7^{24-27}, not to mention His ethical teaching as a whole. I do not deny that the distinction in question needs in some form to be made: but it must be remembered that Paul was first led to make it (so far as we can see) when

resisting the demand for *circumcision* as a moral requirement, and that the controversy thus roused led him—as the above-quoted passages show—into inconsistency, wherein we should do well not to follow him. Faith is normally at least *implicit*, if not explicit, in willing obedience to a divine law: and there is no final incompatibility between the Fatherhood of God and His kingly authority.

Dr. Scott's eagerness to defend Paulinism as he understands it leads him (p. 33) into a strange depreciation of Clement's words: " . . . the blood of Christ . . . brought the grace of repentance to all the world". So far from complaining that these words contain not a trace of Paul's interpretation of the Cross, ought we not rather to praise their author for describing the work of Christ in less metaphorical and more exact terms than even Paul ever used? For what does "ransom" mean if not the consequences of repentance? Surely the death of Christ is a ransom and propitiation just because it induces repentance.

Several rather curious chronological and other slips occur in the book. Hermas and Marcion are put in the *second* half of the second century. The *Epistle of Barnabas* is dated between 80 and 120; the usually recognized alternatives being either 71-79, or *c.* 130. Cyprian is placed at the beginning (instead of the middle) of the third century. On p. 139 the words "the first century" are apparently a slip for "the second century", since neither Judas Maccabaeus nor *II Macc.* can be placed in the middle of the first century B.C. There are other slips on pp. 157, 166, 214.

Incidentally, Congregationalist readers of Dr. Scott's valuable little book will be interested to learn from so eminent a Presbyterian that, while no type of Church-organization

> can claim to rest on direct instructions given by our Lord or by His Apostles, it is clear that the Independent type, in its theory, stands nearest to the Church type which we find in the New Testament . . .

C. J. Cadoux.

Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire 867—1185. By J. M. Hussey. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d.

"Of the Byzantine Empire", wrote Lecky,

> the universal verdict of history is that it constitutes, without a single exception, the most thoroughly base and despicable form that civilization has yet assumed . . . There has been no other enduring civilization so absolutely destitute of all the forms and elements of greatness, and none to which the epithet *mean* may be so emphatically applied . . . The history of the empire is a monotonous story of the intrigues of priests, eunuchs and women, of poisonings, of conspiracies, of uniform ingratitude, of perpetual fratricides.

It is now some time since wise men like Lecky wrote habitually in so stupid a manner concerning the Byzantine Empire. The old-fashioned rationalists have indeed died out, and the new-fashioned rationalists have yet to hear of the Byzantine Empire. There is still undoubtedly in Roman Catholic circles an ungenerous reluctance to do justice to Byzantine Christianity. The great Orthodox Church of the East has never accepted the comparatively modern pretensions of the Bishops of Rome. It preserves many of the traditions of an earlier age of Christendom; and for this the Vatican cannot forgive it. Slowly however Byzantine civilization is coming to its own. Only the narrowest ecclesiastical and anti-clerical prejudices join to keep alive the malicious ignorance of Lecky's generation.

Miss Hussey's book is a welcome reminder of one of the greatest ages in Byzantine history. The three centuries covered by it provided a breathing-space between two periods of peril. The danger from the Arabs was over. The barbarism of the Turks had not yet found an effective ally in the greed of the Venetians. The Iconoclastic emperors had re-established the superiority of Christian over Mohammedan arms, and on that military superiority was laid the foundation of the great age described by Miss Hussey.

The book is almost equally concerned with the ecclesiastical and the intellectual life of Byzantium. The only name usually made familiar by the textbooks is that of Michael Psellus. Here we have a careful, sympathetic, and shrewd study not only of Psellus but also of his friends and successors. We breathe the atmosphere of a civilized world, with its love of nature, its sense of history, its vivid appreciation of human character, its sincere and informed piety. For example: Miss Hussey writes of the historians that they

> are more mature than their western counterparts; they offer their readers something, both in presentation and in psychological insight, that was the fruit of a long and continuous tradition, not only of erudition, but of culture.

Miss Hussey has no difficulty in shewing how unjust and ill-informed is the usual account of the "subjection" of the Church to the State in the Byzantine Empire. The two were one body, and it would be precisely as reasonable to talk of the subjection of the State to the interests of the Church.

The part of Miss Hussey's book which leaves the clearest impression is her study of monasticism. She brings out very plainly the manner in which Byzantine monasticism differed from the great Orders of the western Church. There was in the east the same regard for ascetic life, but it produced houses more numerous, shorter-lived, often smaller, and almost always more independent of one another. In Symeon the Young Miss Hussey has found a mystic whose works reveal his personality in a remarkable way. Of him she offers a sympathetic and illuminating study.

Miss Hussey's book is valuable for the detailed information which it contains, but it leaves to the reader rather too much of the work of thinking the facts into the general fabric of Byzantine history. The result is a little scrappy. Miss Hussey is inclined to be allusive where we wish she would be explicit. She appears to disagree to some extent with Bury about the coronation of the Emperor and about the hereditary principle and the imperial succession; we should have welcomed a fuller discussion, if the divergence of opinion is intentional. Miss Hussey writes well and pleasantly, but she can turn out an awkward sentence at times: "The eleventh-century mystic Symeon the Young's capacity" is a phrase suggesting the accumulative style of German scholarship or of New York journalism. The Oxford Press nods heavily on page 175.

B. L. Manning.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley may be correct in his modest statement that there is nothing new in *A Fresh Approach to the Psalms* (Nicholson & Watson, 8s. 6d.): that does not detract from the volume's usefulness, for it is a compendium to which scholars and working ministers will often turn. Dr. Oesterley first draws attention to Psalms (and their common themes)

in other Eastern lands, and then goes on to discuss the dates of the Psalms, their titles, their poetical structure, and the different collections. Valuable chapters follow on music in the ancient East and an account of the use of worship in the synagogue and in the Christian Church. The Messianic Psalms are then examined, and three chapters on the theology of the Psalms deserve careful study. This bare indication of the contents of the volume will serve to show not merely its richness but how easily reference to it may be made.

Theological students are often recommended to continue some special line of study when they enter the ministry. Dutifully and obediently, therefore, we attempted to keep abreast of work being done on the Synoptic problem, and though it has often meant dragging on painfully a lap or more behind the scholars, we contrive to find a way to examine new books on the problem. *The Mission and Message of Jesus* (Nicholson & Watson, 25s.), a massive volume of 1,000 pages, carries three names on its title-page—Drs. H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, and C. J. Wright (Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist), a happy illustration of Christian union in the sphere of scholarship. There has been as yet no time to work through the book (though we notice a wrong initial on p. 677), but it can be unhesitatingly recommended: it successfully carries out its plan of providing an untechnical and up-to-date introduction (using the *R.V.* for the commentary), and the ordinary minister or teacher will find it extremely serviceable. Here we can do no more than outline the scheme of the volume. Dr. Major, after a General Introduction, deals in Book I ("Incidents in the Life of Jesus") with *Mk.*, the incidents in *Mt.* not in *Mk.*, and the incidents in *Lk.* not in *Mt.* or *Mk.* In Book II ("The Sayings of Jesus") Dr. Manson discusses the teaching of Jesus, and provides a commentary on "Q" and on the teaching peculiar to *Mt.* and *Lk.* respectively. Dr. Wright's contribution—Book III ("Jesus: The Revelation of God")—is on the Fourth Gospel; on the difficult question of authorship he is inclined to agree that "the author is some great anonymous personality whose mind is revealed in the Johannine writings".

Novelists and scenario writers are turning to the Bible in increasing numbers, which is an indication of both intelligence and rashness—intelligence in the recognition of the place where human interest is to be found, rashness in the assumption that the Bible can be improved upon. Mr. Richard Blaker's *David of Judah* (Nisbet, 8s. 6d.) is disappointing. It does not hold the reader as does Josef Wentner's *Saul*: the imposition of a modern atmosphere, modern language, even modern bluntness—"guts", "belly", and the like, as well as David as a "Big Shot", the Adullamites engaged on a "racket"—do not add to the force of the narrative, but rather the reverse. Such vulgarization is not an improvement; but then, to Mr. Blaker, the eighth Psalm is a "rollicking shanty".

The first volumes of a series of "Biblical Biographies" (Barker, 5s. each) are also before us, and, as so often with a series, the variety in treatment, and in the success which attends it, is striking. Mr. Michael Home writes about *David* with due restraint and regard for authorities, though Mr. St. John Ervine is wrongly spelt, and a distinguished Methodist scholar unhappily becomes "W. L. Waddle". Miss Pamela Frankau wisely decided that she was not made for research (she gives an amusing account of her efforts in this direction, in which she calls Sir George Adam Smith's famous work *The Geographical History of the Holy Land*). In her *Jezebel* she lets her imagination play round the Queen, the King, and Elijah, and makes a good story. Mr. George A. Birmingham may also have been expected to write as a novelist, but he does not; his *Isaiah* is rather the work of a

preacher, and there Mr. Birmingham suffers from the fact that the *Book of Isaiah* was treated homiletically in inimitable fashion by George Adam Smith many years ago. It is probably the inevitable comparison which makes Mr. Birmingham's pages seem to lack life and sparkle. Miss Margaret Goldsmith was entrusted with *Joseph,* and to few is it given to be so sure of anything as Miss Goldsmith is of everything. Not merely does she know infinitely more about the homes of the patriarchs than the Biblical writers—"Few men in the Bible enjoyed his food as Isaac did"; "It can be assumed without a doubt that Isaac and Rebekah quarrelled constantly about their sons"; "Esau bore his mother's nagging and his father's senility until he was 40 years old"—but she dogmatizes about physiology, and even knows that Jacob's marriage with Leah was "painfully consummated".

The preacher often finds himself in danger of regarding the Bible merely as material for sermons, and sometimes he is surprised by its never-failing power of speaking home to his own soul. Similarly the reviewer, in the rush of publication, is pulled up sharp by a book which will not let him sink the individual in the official. Preacher and reviewer alike forget their tasks and know only that this is a book which finds them. Such was our experience with Mr. C. F. Andrews's **Christ and Prayer* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d. & 2s. 6d.), which sets out to expound "the words of Christ about Prayer as they are recorded in the Gospels". It is not so much what the book contains as the sensitive spirit of the writer which appeals; here, we feel, is one who is "far ben", who has learnt a secret which we would be glad to know. The "Notes on the Practice of Prayer" are exceptionally helpful.

Those who feel that they do not gain all they ought from the privilege of prayer will be glad to read Mr. Michael Bruce's *The Science of Prayer* (S.P.C.K., 3s. & 2s.), which was originally written for Chinese students, and Miss F. A. MacLeod's *The Royal Gate* (S.P.C.K., 3s.), "A Handbook for Beginners to the Science and Art of Prayer". If they desire to understand the place devotion occupies in Roman Catholic worship they should turn to the Rev. C. C. Martindale's *The Mind of the Missal* (Sheed & Ward, 3s. 6d.).

New volumes in Rich and Cowan's "Needs of To-day" series (3s. 6d.) are the Bishop of Bradford's *Our Need for God* and the Rev. E. Shillito's *You Can Find God*. They are both readable and useful, and it is good to have a Bishop saying frankly that while he hates both Communism and Fascism if it came to a choice between them he would choose Communism. Mr. Shillito begins on the resolute and virile dictum, "*It is high time* that those who speak upon the Christian Gospel should drop the apologetic note". He discusses freshly and suggestively the roads along which man seeks the joy which comes to him who finds, while there is a welcome tribute to a Lancashire Sunday School.

We read at the same time two big books, Mrs. Hicks Beach's *A Cardinal of the Medici* and M. Nicholas Berdyaev's **The Destiny of Man* (Centenary Press, 16s.), the first for pleasure, the second for discipline. Ministers are always counselled to have some work on hand which keeps their minds on the stretch: let them try M. Berdyaev. The Russian scholar and his translators do not temper the wind to the shorn lamb: on the first page there is an epistemological north-easter and soon we are in a veritable blizzard about the origin of good and evil. Perhaps the best and fairest thing will be to indicate the contents of the book. Part I, "Principles", consists of "The Problem of Ethical Knowledge"; "The Origin of Good and Evil"; "Man". Part II, "Morality on this

Side of Good and Evil", which many will find the most suggestive section, after dealing with "The Ethics of Law", "The Ethics of Redemption", and "The Ethics of Creativeness", discusses "Concrete Problems of Ethics". The discussion of such subjects as War and Communism is the easiest but the weakest part of the book, for here one feels that M. Berdyaev forsakes his judicial attitude. Part III, "Eschatological Ethics", deals with the "Last Things"—"Death and Immortality", "Hell", and "Paradise beyond Good and Evil". There is some unreality in this section; it is far from true to say that "Man is tormented by the presentiment of Hell".

There are few sections in a book of 374 pages which the reader will not want to stop and ponder; theologians, philosophers, psychologists, and anthropologists will all do well to work through it. One of M. Berdyaev's main services to British learning is his introduction of unknown writers. Kierkegaard and Heidegger are becoming known, but how many professors in theological colleges know anything about Tareyev or Bachofen (whose *Das Mutterrecht* Berdyaev describes as a work of genius) or are acquainted with Scheler's *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materielle Werthethik*?

It is no doubt the very high standard which Dr. Rufus Jones has led us to expect in his books which is responsible for our disappointment with his volume of Cole Lectures, *Some Problems of Life* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.). The Quaker scholar could not write without leading his readers along fruitful paths of thought and service, but somehow we did not find the same freshness of illustration as in so many previous books. The Lectures are concerned in the main with the question of values, which naturally leads to a discussion of the nature of personality, and a re-emphasis on the eternal values to be found by persons in the life and teaching of Jesus.

We have arrived at the stage when we tremble to read in the Preface of books by ministers of "the extraordinary number of people who wish to consult me", as we do in the Rev. H. Mortimer Sinfield's *God and My Life* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). Much influenced by the Group Movement, Mr. Sinfield writes of the difference belief in God makes to life. Having in mind untrained readers, he deals with practical rather than intellectual problems, but, as so often, one cannot but be conscious of the lack of "bones": Studdert-Kennedy's quotations at the head of many of the chapters shine by contrast with the sloppy sentiment of much of Mr. Sinfield's treatment. The time is coming when it will be possible to test the Group's success in holding people as well as in changing them: there is a good deal to show that emotional change—such as this book, for example, might work—does not last.

Sir Francis Younghusband's *A Venture of Faith* (Michael Joseph, 12s. 6d.) describes the World Congress of Faiths held in London last July, a Conference which would never have been held but for Sir Francis's vision and enthusiasm. An official Report of the Congress has already been published; in this volume the distinguished explorer tells how he came to be interested in religion and how the scheme for the Congress was worked out. An account of the sessions, with speakers from all over the world representing the varied faiths, then follows. In the immense variety of opinion the reader cannot but be struck by the frequent recurrence of the view that the present is a time of crisis. Sir Francis says the leading personalities were the Japanese Buddhist, Suzuki; the Hindu Radhakrishnan; the Russian Berdyaev; and the English Lord Allen: he complains that the Church and the clergy and ministers were lukewarm. Sir Frederick Whyte's name is wrongly spelt.

A very important volume, which should be read not merely by all the delegates to the Edinburgh Conference, but by all students of the relations between the Churches, is *The Ministry and the Sacraments* (S.C.M., 18s.), the Report of the Theological Commission of the Faith and Order Movement (the Bishop of Gloucester, Chairman; Dr. R. Dunkerley, Editor). Statements presented by theologians from all the Churches—from the Roman Catholics to the Friends—are printed, the Rev. J. S. Whale stating the view of the Congregationalists, Dr. A. C. Underwood that of the Baptists. We write before giving the book detailed study, but call the attention of readers to these conclusions, to which, apparently a Methodist, a Disciple, and a Congregationalist put their names:

> Baptism in the name of the Trinity is the necessary bond of unity of the Christian Church. A condition of union will be the Celebration of the Eucharist with the unfailing use of the Words of Institution.

Verily the theologians almost persuade us to become Quakers right away. The Bishop of Gloucester, in a concluding "Review of the Problems", in which he generously bestows Doctor's degrees among Free Churchmen, aptly sums up the discussions.

A first examination of the volume leaves us with an impression of unreality: there is still a vast gulf separating the views of those who gather in these Conferences and the rank and file of the Churches they represent. Edinburgh, we trust, will not fail to recognize that fact.

Let's Get Things Right (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) consists of earnest, forceful chapters in which Dr. Howard Somervell, the climber-doctor-missionary, shows the difference Christ makes to thought and life. The chapter on "Christ and the Use of Money" is exceptionally good.

Prof. John C. Bennett, whose *Social Salvation* was reviewed here some time ago, is one of the younger voices to which Americans are listening; we warmly welcome his thoughtful little book **Christianity and Our World* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.). Prof. Bennett first outlines elements in common morality necessary if human life is to hold together (the "recognition of the falseness of individualistic egoism", the necessity of universalism, personal discipline, integrity, democracy, and monogamy) and then the Christian ideal built on this foundation—humility, sensitiveness, commitment. The business of Christians to-day is

> to translate the idea of love in its relation to the economic problem from terms of philanthropy into terms of justice;

and the Church has its great opportunity in that

> it is the only organism within a nation which by its very nature must be loyal to a God beyond the State, to humanity beyond the nation, to the Kingdom of God beyond any actual social order.

Though sometimes as we read *Brotherhood Economics* (S.C.M., 5s.) we are obliged to smile at Toyohiko Kagawa's history and geography—he evidently thinks the inhabitants of "Rochdale, near Manchester, England" are "canny Scots" (whatever will Miss Gracie Fields say?)—we cannot but love the writer and be moved by his zeal and self-sacrifice. In the Lord's Prayer he finds an "outstanding lesson in economics", and only when its principles are applied to society as a whole can Christians be content. He therefore urges "brotherhood economics," the establishment of seven types of co-operative society—health and life insurance, producers, marketing, credit, mutual aid, public utility, and consumers—as the only way to get rid of exploitation. The method by which the transfer from the capitalist system to the co-operative state can be effected is then described.

Students of political philosophy will find Mr. R. H. S. Crossman's *Plato To-day* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) as informing and helpful as those engaged in politics will find it stimulating. Mr. Crossman outlines—in rather slapdash fashion, with little precision, for "hundreds" and "scores" repeatedly appear—Plato's historical background, surveys his life and writings, and then sets him loose on the modern world. Our political system—"the safest defence against real democracy is the 'noble lie' of Representative Government"—education, the family, communism, National Socialism, are analysed in turn, after which we get Mr. Crossman's own views.

In these pages we have not failed to appreciate the contribution that Dr. Inge has made to life and learning. Sometimes, however, on opening the *Evening Standard* on Wednesdays we have rather regretted to see him represented by articles which have "pot boiler" written all over them. It is not always so, and the pick of these articles is to be found in *A Rustic Moralist* (Putnam, 7s. 6d.). The best part of the volume, however, consists not of articles but of the lecture, "Greeks and Barbarians", delivered to the Classical Society. The address on "Prayer" at the Modern Churchman's Conference in 1936 is also included.

Mr. Kenneth Ingram always writes incisively, and his *Christianity—Right or Left ?* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) should make Christians think hard. There is nothing new in the contention that modern civilization is unchristian because its world government is founded on national sovereignty and its social organization on a class system, though many will not be as frank as Mr. Ingram in expressing humiliation at his tardiness in realizing that Christian social principles will be unfulfilled until an international and classless order has been created. Mr. Ingram shows how Fascism is capitalism and nationalism *in excelsis,* and he proceeds to argue that in the inevitable choice between right and left, Fascism and Communism, Christianity can only move to the left if true to its own principles. If a little tender toward Communism's failings, Mr. Ingram answers convincingly the stock arguments glibly brought against Communist theory and practice.

For the first time we find it impossible to give unqualified praise to a book by Mr. John S. Hoyland. *That Inferiority Feeling* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) contains some good stuff, of course, but it is not a good book; innumerable times we learn that "nature rewards a minus by a double plus", and Mr. Hoyland seems to have surrendered himself absolutely to the Adlerian psychologists. We are sorry that he has given to a student-group the rather jaundiced impression of human nature one gets from the three or four writers greatly relied upon in these pages. Mr. Hoyland's own message is greatly needed to-day, and we do not wish it to be weakened by too much dependence on individual—or other—psychologists.

Miss M. D. Petre's **My Way of Faith* (Dent, 10s. 6d.), opened without any unusual anticipation, has proved an intensely rewarding book. Well known for her association with Roman Catholic modernists who fell under or just escaped the ban, Miss Petre has an unusual story to tell. It is not merely in describing the views of the modernists and the attitude of authority that she has much that is important to say; whether describing a Roman Catholic home, expounding Thomism (a valuable chapter), or telling of her personal relationships with Von Hügel, Henri Bremond, and Tyrrell, she instructs and fascinates, and the fact that she does not conceal her affection for Tyrrell makes her narrative all the more poignant. We have learnt much from the book, and strongly recommend it to the attention of our readers.

With Miss Petre's book Dr. Maurice Nédoncelle's *Baron Friedrich Von Hügel: A Study of His Life and Thought* (Longmans, 8s. 6d.) makes a striking contrast. The writer is a Catholic priest, and therefore writes from a definite angle, and the lack of freedom is the more obvious when one has been breathing the refreshing air of the lady's pages. The chapter on the "Life" is therefore what might be expected; where the book has its value is in the exposition of Von Hügel's views; the Baron was never easy reading, and Dr. Nédoncelle has rendered good service in elucidating his position in regard to such subjects as "The Method of Religious Philosophy", "The Natural Order", Christianity", "The Church", "The Mystical Life". The book is a translation from the French.

We have to confess that we knew only two of the "eminent writers" who contribute to *The Root of the Matter* (Cassell, 5s.), Canon H. R. L. Sheppard (the Editor) and Mr. J. D. Beresford. What the Editor's functions were does not appear, for, readable as the book is, it is not easy to find the relation between the articles, and while Canon Sheppard's earnest appeal "Religion" takes only 25 pages, Mr. Lionel Birch's "Politics" (youthful, with "cock-eyed" the favourite epithet, but attractive in its enthusiasm) uses nearly 100, and could have been shortened with advantage. Mr. Beresford ("Human Relations"), Mr. J. S. Collis ("The Poetic Approach to Reality"), and Mr. H. W. Heckstall-Smith ("Education") all have wise things to say: the last named's counsels for teachers are specially good.

It is well that the late Headmaster at Bedales should, in *A Schoolmaster's Testament* (Blackwell, 7s. 6d.) have passed on the results of his forty years educational experience. Bedales was the second of the New Schools, Mr. Badley having had the advantage of three years at Abbotsholme before the school he was to make famous was opened in 1893. The contrast between the Rugby of his own schoodays and the new school is indeed marked, and no one can doubt the value of the contribution Bedales has made to education. The discussion of freedom and discipline, of co-education, and of religion in the school is timely, and all connected with teaching will not fail to learn something from it; the general acceptance of the conception of education as "training of the living for living by living" would do much to transform much school life. A misprint on p. 106 should be corrected.

The reading of Mr. A. S. Neill's *That Dreadful School* (Jenkins, 5s.) has had an unfortunate effect on us. Previously we had appreciated Mr. Neill and his fight for freedom in education; now, had we a child of school age, we should not send him to Summerhill. And why? Because Mr. Neill has been so badly bitten by the psychoanalysis bug, and has swallowed Freud practically wholesale. All his obsessions, therefore, he transfers to the poor children whom he analyses in "Private Lessons"; and, of course, we learn that "most children (and most adults) swear", that a boy has "done what we have all done—pinched a bob"; and, of course, that everybody has masturbated—the bee ever buzzing loudly in Mr. Neill's bonnet. Mr. Neill has evidently been very unlucky in his experience of churches and Christians: "Russia is the only really Christian country left. That is why it abolished its churches"; the fact that, unlike Mr. Badley, he never mentions the Friends and their schools is significant. Where Mr. Neill is absolutely on the spot is in his emphasis on the sense of justice in children; fuller investigation of the origin of the "It isn't fair" attitude would have been infinitely worth while.

The Rev. R. W. Wilde's *Magic Windows* (Lindsey Press, 1s.) contains sixteen ten-minute talks to girls and boys. We like best the story about

Cruikshank, who used to sign his name "George Cruikshank, O.P.K." and explained to mystified people that this was "Orange Peel Kicker".

Another volume of children's addresses which can be specially recommended is the Rev. J. R. Edwards's *Everybody's King* (Carey Press, 2s. 6d.), the work of a Baptist minister who knows how to use humour in talking to young people.

From Robert Morant Dr. Bernard M. Allen has turned to *Augustus Caesar* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.), and perhaps it is not altogether fanciful to suggest that the two had something in common. Dr. Allen has given us a workmanlike biography, though sometimes his sentences are peculiar, as, for example:

> he [Octavius] never once seems to have contemplated the idea of divorcing her [Livia], as another great ruler did, nineteen centuries later, in order to obtain an heir.

Livia seems to have beaten Methuselah! Dr. Allen emphasizes the constructive aspect of Octavius's rule, and in general writes as an advocate and defender, almost a champion, of the first Emperor.

Mrs. Hicks Beach's *A Cardinal of the Medici* (Cambridge Press, 15s.) is a real *tour-de-force*. One of the most successful reconstructions of the past known to us, it is based on sound scholarship, and is written in a style which grows on one through the long chapters. Sentences like these are common:

> one of those dateless days which yesterday does not usher in and to-morrow may never drive out.
>
> there was between us in these days that which cannot be unpacked in phrases
>
> a world in which woman watches man pursuing his vocation of being man, with only fleeting thought for herself.

It is always difficult to tell a story in the first person, but the unknown mother of Ippolito, one of the many Medici bastards, Cardinal against his will at 18, Il Magnifico at 19, dead of malaria (or was it poison?) at 25, serves Mrs. Hicks Beach wonderfully well. Here and there the canvas is too crowded, and it is to be feared that some readers, to whom the story is unfamiliar, will be put off by the first chapters. But what a dazzling picture these colourful Renaissance folk make: two Medici Popes; the little Catherine—to play so great a part in the world's history; scholars and ecclesiastics, reformers and statesmen, Raphael, Michelangelo, Titian, emperors and soldiers. And amid the panorama Ippolito's tragic love-affair, doomed to futility, and finally thwarted unwittingly by the mother who bore him, whom he knew only as friend and not as mother. The book cannot be read quickly, but it repays reading: it is long since we handled a book of this type which held us in the same way. Grammar or spelling on pp. 17, 18, 86 needs attention.

Mr. Algernon Cecil has turned from Metternich, man of the world *par excellence*, to More, man of two worlds, saint, scholar, prophet—and statesman to boot. Many lives of More have been written from Roper's little gem to that of Prof. R. W. Chambers: to them Mr. Cecil has added a mammoth, though not altogether superfluous, biography, *A Portrait of Thomas More* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 16s.). He writes as a convinced Roman Catholic, believing that More and Erasmus were right and that Luther and Calvin were mistaken, and that there is no half-way house between their positions. As the work of an able writer who has read widely the biography deserves attention. Mr. Cecil loves to turn a phrase, and we

suspect that there will be many, like ourselves, who will turn back with pleasant relief from his artificial, if expert, sentences to the simplicity of Roper.

The Secret of St. Margaret Mary (Sheed & Ward, 2s. 6d.) is a translation of M. Henri Ghéon's life of Margaret Mary Alacoque (1647-1690), the founder of the Feast of the Sacred Heart, who was beatified in 1864 and canonized in 1920. It is a strange story of mystical ecstasy and bodily suffering, one of those cases so easily labelled "pathological" which furnish some of the most perplexing varieties of religious experience.

Mrs. Janet Whitney in *Elizabeth Fry* (Harrap, 12s. 6d.) has told again, and told well, the story of the "Quaker heroine". Her biography presents not merely an account of her work in prisons, but also a period picture of Quaker life, with the problems presented when parents and children regard life differently. The conflict between private and public duty is also seen; few resolved that conflict so well as Elizabeth Fry. Mrs. Whitney does excellent service in letting us see the Gurney and Fry families—and what families these people had!

Already once divorced, August Strindberg was in the forties when in 1893 he married Freda Uhl, the 18-year-old daughter of an Austrian editor. Two years later they separated, and Strindberg was divorced from the wife he subsequently married. In *Marriage with Genius* (Cape, 12s. 6d.) Mrs. Freda Strindberg tells the story of the two years of her life with the dramatist. Gushing and unrestrained, with scarcely a date from beginning to end, the book improves as it goes along and finally holds the reader in its grip. The girl was fascinated by the man known as the "woman-hater"; she little knew the "complexes" he had brought with him from his childhood, or the life his first wife had lived. He experimented on his wives, regarding them as objects of scientific curiosity as he did sulphur or the moon; he hated while he loved, and with the madman's megalomania regarded all others as subordinate and contributory to his own life and interests. Mr. St. John Ervine has aptly compared Strindberg with D. H. Lawrence, whom he calls a "grotesque detestable person . . . incessantly whining and snivelling and cadging, and, like Strindberg, always ungrateful to his benefactors". Men like Strindberg are not made for happiness, and they are certainly "impossible to live with". Mrs. Strindberg has told us much in this informing book, which awakes profound compassion for the girl "married with genius".

In a *blasé* world that despises enthusiasms and deprecates hero-worship it is good to find M. Emile Cammaerts writing what he frankly admits is a eulogy of his friend, G. K. Chesterton. *The Laughing Prophet* (Methuen, 8s. 6d.) has for its sub-title "The Seven Virtues and G. K. Chesterton", and Chesterton and his writings are considered under the heads Faith, Hope, Charity, Wisdom, Innocence, Justice, Courage. A bibliography is added. The book will give joy to those—and they are many—who found inspiration and stimulus in the articles and books which flowed in rapid succession from the fertile brain, the happy wit, and the earnest purpose of G.K.C.

In *Four Generations of Our Royal Family* (Allen & Unwin, 10s.) Lord Holden has given us a chatty book, well suited for the arm-chair. Apart from the final chapters, it is written in the ironic manner; the excellent illustrations (with captions from Queen Victoria's journals) are in tune with the text, though we might have been spared a full-page wedding bouquet. The style is sometimes ponderous, as when we are told that

> had the Prince been of a less exalted rank, his punishment would have partaken of a more corporal nature.

Lord Holden has his own opinions; he thinks, for example, that the ex-Kaiser is "probably the most maligned figure living in Europe to-day". Once again we see Victoria's objectionable qualities—her pre-occupation with herself, snobbishness, and partiality. In her jealousy of the attractive young Princess of Wales she writes

> Everyone said that the difference shown, when I appeared and when Bertie and Alix drive, was not to be described. Naturally for them no one stops or runs, as they always did, and do doubly now, for me.

And at the time when she is telling Rosebery that for 57 years she has held the Constitution as a sacred trust she is writing a "very private" letter to Lord Salisbury to ask " . . . Is the unionist party ready for a dissolution?"

If there is a little too much of the biographer Mr. Sidney Dark's life of his friend, *Mackay of All Saints'* (Centenary Press, 6s.), nevertheless presents a true picture of the complex personality whose work as a leader of the Anglo-Catholics was not the less important because it was not in the limelight. The book has been written in a hurry—we learn three times at least that Mackay never contemplated change of ecclesiastical allegiance—but it is alive, and Mr. Dark's sympathy does not dull his sense of criticism. Mackay was perhaps at his best as a preacher; the illustrations Mr. Dark quotes show that he was poet and mystic as well. He had a great gift of painting a scene, though he could when need be use staccato sentences to enforce his points:

> It was because God could not redeem us by His love that He came to redeem us by His Blood.
>
> It is no argument against Christ that He has bitter, unrelenting, plotting enemies. All strong personalities have. But it does seem to be an argument against Him that He has such a lot of rotten adherents.

Mr. Dark brings out very well all that Mackay did at All Saints', Margaret Street—in worship and confessional, for the drama and for his beloved choir-boys. He emphasizes his lack of acquaintance with the poor, and the fact that he was "nice" and "pernickety", one who never left Oxford and never went to Hoxton. His portrait will, however, not fail to satisfy Mackay's friends, among whom we are privileged to count ourselves.

The Rev. W. K. Burford, the veteran Congregational minister, has throughout his life combined a teaching ministry with a sense of humour which is a delight to his friends. Both these aspects of his life are represented in *Songs and Sentiments* (Indep. Press, 5s.), and in addition we have hymns and devotional and other verses. Some of Mr. Burford's stories are exceptionally good.

In *Ensor Walters* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) the Rev. E. W. Walters, one of the fifteen children of that remarkable man, W. D. Walters, tells of his brother, now President of the Methodist Conference, and "the London he loves". Mr. Bernard Shaw contributes "Memories of Early Years", and there are some good Cockney stories. We like the reply of the policeman on point duty in a busy London street to the old lady's inquiry, "Officer, where do I get the next bus to Hackney?": "If you stand there long enough, Mum, I'm afraid you'll get it in your back".

We are puzzled to know why we have not liked Mr. H. A. Vachell's autobiography, *Distant Fields* (Cassell, 12s. 6d.). Many of his novels we have read with pleasure, but we have been conscious of something like

irritation as we have turned these pages. Maybe it is unconscious resentment at Mr. Vachell's good fortune—Harrow, "best sellers", and the like! Generally Mr. Vachell has been able to "do himself well", and now in his old age he chats rather garrulously about his youth in California, his novels and his plays, his cellar and his clubs, his sport and his garden, and the people he has met. He tells many a good story, one of the best of which is the saying attributed to Cambon when Italy was still neutral during the War:

> Italy, when the moment comes, will fly to the assistance of the conqueror.

Quinney's, Brothers, and *The Hill* will, we think, be read long after this autobiography is forgotten.

"A Study in Arrogance", the sub-title of Mr. H. C. Armstrong's *Grey Steel* (Barker, 9s.), suggests the angle from which the writer surveys General Smuts. Mr. Armstrong does not get into his stride for a time; but once he starts, he writes readably and well. The reader, too, takes time to accommodate himself to the situation, not realizing that he is to have, not a judicial estimate of the South African statesman, but a partisan sketch. General Smuts is seen as a theorist and administrator, good at handling papers but inept at handling men, an expert raider but no general, terrifically industrious but with eyes which fail to see what the ordinary man is doing. *Holism and Evolution* is dismissed in a few lines, but much space is devoted to the exposition of the conception of its author as "Slim Jannie".

It is curious and unfortunate that Mr. A. J. Russell has not learnt the lesson that a journalist does well to learn early in his career—that good wine needs no bush, and a good story no colouring. In *Healing In His Wings* (Methuen, 5s.) he describes the life and work of "Dorothy", who, miraculously healed herself, founded a House of Healing with half-a-crown. An Irish girl, Dorothy is a modern St. Teresa; she has her visions of the Lord, feels His healing touch, and is able by her presence and her faith to heal others. Mr. Russell unhappily describes everything about her work in the sob-stuff style only too common in much of the daily press: even the cherry cake is the most wonderful of all cherry cakes: and Dorothy says of the fact that her name means *The Gift of God* "Isn't that just too wonderful?"

Dr. A. Compton Rickett's *Portraits and Personalities* (Selwyn & Blount, 12s. 6d.) contains more than thirty papers—divided into "Portraits", "Enthusiasms", and "Personalities and Personalism"—and quite a few misprints. We liked the autobiographical sketches best, and unexpectedly found the political portraits better than the literary ones, some of which were commonplace. The championship of George Eliot is welcome, and there are apt sentences such as:

> Galsworthy tries to *explain* life, and Wells to *arrange* life; but Bennett is content to *register* life.

Two brief sketches of Blake Odgers and Sir Hugh Fraser and a racy account of an American editor's attempt to persuade Coulson Kernahan to write an "inside account" of Swinburne are among the most pleasing things in the book.

There is something reminiscent of the bad old days of which the Hon. Edward Cadogan writes in the title of *The Roots of Evil* (Murray, 9s.): "Being a Treatise on the Methods of dealing with Crime and the Criminal during the 18th and 19th centuries in relation to those of a More Enlightened Age". The death penalty, public executions, the hulks, trans-

portation and the life of convicts abroad, prison life and its abuses—the horrible things Mr. Cadogan has to describe prove one thing at any rate, that in one field of human activity there has been progress. Chapters deal with the work of John Howard and Elizabeth Fry, and finally there are observations on the reformed prisons of to-day, and notably in regard to juvenile delinquents. The style is also suggestive of older times; but what are we to make of a man "who was incidentally hanged a few days previously"?

Mr. Richmond Harvey's *Prison from Within* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), a realistic account of life in Wormwood Scrubbs during an imprisonment of eighteen months, should be read by all social workers: it will show them that, despite improvements in our prison system in the last generation, there is still much scope for their reforming activities. The main impressions left on one are (1) the importance food occupies in the minds of the prisoners; (2) the low standard of intelligence of so many of them—a challenge to educationalists; (3) the folly of incarcerating sexual perverts with normal prisoners. Mr. Harvey maintains that credit for the fact that so few discharged men return to Wormwood Scrubbs is due not to the prison system, but to themselves; nevertheless he maintains that it is almost impossible for men to "stage a come-back", and he thinks there is truth in Oscar Wilde's words: "all trials are trials for one's life, and all sentences are sentences of death".

Some time ago we referred to the discoveries of Ogino and Knaus in regard to the periods of fertility, and commented on their revolutionary effect on methods of contraception. Dr. J. G. H. Holt, of Utrecht, working in co-operation with another Dutch physician, Dr. J. N. J. Smulders, has tested and corrected the Ogino-Knaus theories, and in *Marriage and Periodic Abstinence* (Longmans, 8s. 6d.) presents, with abundant reference to cases, a convincing statement of the revised theory. Emphasizing the folly of generalizing from one woman to another, Dr. Holt works out a formula fixing the time of fertility round about ovulation, so that times of abstinence can be determined or, on the other hand, desired conception secured. This is not the place to go into detail, and even medical men will find some of Dr. Holt's charts and datometers rather difficult at first; suffice it to say that the case now seems to be proved, though there will undoubtedly be the strongest opposition from those with vested interests in the sale of contraceptives.

The lot of the reviewer who has to deal fairly and adequately with *The Legacy of India* (Oxford Press, 10s.) in a few lines is calculated to arouse sympathy with an editor and contributors who had to survey thousands of years of the history of a vast and varied land in some 400 pages. Mr. G. T. Garratt is to be congratulated on the measure of success he has achieved; from the Marquis of Zetland's Introduction to his own final chapter, "Indo-British Civilization", there are few contributions which do not repay reading; some give considerable ground for disquiet, which may perhaps best be passed on to the reader by quoting Mr. Garratt's dictum that

> the last 150 years have proved the most disappointing and in some ways the most sterile in Indian history.

Mr. F. W. Thomas deals with language and literature, Mr. K. de B. Codrington with art and archæology, Mr. Martin S. Briggs with Muslim architecture, Mr. Fox-Strangways with music, Mr. W. E. Clark with science. Among other articles are Mr. R. P. Masani's "Caste and the Structure of Society", M. de la Vallée Poussin's "Buddhism", Sir S.

Radhakrishnan's "Hinduism", and Mr. Abdul Qadir's "Cultural Influences of Islam". There are numerous illustrations, some of which also appear in Dr. Will Durant's *The Story of Civilization,* of which Vol. I, "Our Oriental Heritage" (Allen & Unwin, 20s.), is a volume of over 1,000 pages (the jacket speaks of the whole work as "monumental" and compares it with that of the French Encyclopedists). Dr. Durant, whose *Story of Philosophy* is known to many of our readers, apparently started twenty years ago to write a history of the 19th century. Like many writers before him, he found himself immersed in "origins", and eventually decided to write "a history of all civilization, ancient and modern, Occidental and Oriental". The present volume, the first-fruits of his work, is to be followed by volumes on the Classical, Medieval, European, and Modern Heritage respectively. Chronological charts and tables, glossary and bibliography, are all there, and a first examination inclines us to think the work will be extremely useful. It is not easy to express an opinion, however, until one has used the volume for some time; especially are we doubtful how the general scheme will work out: we have, for example, 7½ pages on Mahatma Gandhi, who naturally looms larger at present than the second Isaiah, who gets two pages; but will they be regarded thus 2,000 years hence?

In *English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries* (Cape, 15s.) Mr. Geoffrey Baskerville has given us a lively, even a racy, book. He vigorously denounces the "sentimentalists" on the one side and the "scavengers" on the other, and proceeds to demonstrate that Cromwell's "Visitors" acted precisely as episcopal visitors had done for centuries: they were no more hasty, and they put practically the same questions. And often there were excellent precedents for suppression: the action of John Fisher, saint and martyr, in securing the suppression of two nunneries and diverting the revenues to St. John's College, Cambridge, is an admirable example which Mr. Baskerville describes in detail. He also shows that ample provision was made for the heads of suppressed monasteries, while other monks were frequently given "capacities" to act as secular clergy: he "disposes effectively of the legend of persecuted and starving monks". Mr. Baskerville's chapters on leases will be welcomed by all who have had in any way to deal with the relation of laymen to ecclesiastical property: what will be new to many will be the astute manner in which abbots and abbesses gave leases to relatives and others when they saw the "red light" of suppression, often ante-dating the leases. Mr. Baskerville also does well to bring out the active part taken by nobility and gentry in acting as stewards, *etc.,* in the monasteries long before the suppression.

On one or two points Mr. Baskerville gives us pause. He backs his view that money in the 16th century was worth thirty times its present value by the authority of Dr. Salter; but thirty times strikes us as too much. The habit of using old spellings for Abbeys, "Oseney" and "Salley", does not commend itself. The proof-reader's attention seemed to slacken in the middle of the book, where we have "Duke of Cleve's", *Translations* for *Transactions,* and "St. Alban's" for "St. Albans". A refreshing volume.

Mr. Hamish Miles has translated M. André Maurois' *History of England* (Cape, 12s. 6d.) so successfully that it is hard to believe it is a translation; in only one place, "to the indignation of English feeling", does he stumble. In the same way, it is only rarely that M. Maurois betrays the fact that he is not English, though only a foreigner would speak of the Liberal Government's (1906-1910) policy of "the development of nonconformist schools". He shows, indeed, a better understanding of Puritanism and Dissent than many English historians, and asserts that Disraeli

had to recognize that no man could govern England on lines counter to the nonconformist conscience.

The narrative is very readable, and the chapters in which the writer stops to look round extremely good. On some points, as, for example, the importance of the Justice of the Peace, M. Maurois is exceptionally serviceable, and if he is not at his strongest on the ecclesiastical side, he holds the balance even, and there is little at which to cavil, though it would have been well had he read Mr. Baskerville's book just reviewed.

There are some mistakes, to say nothing of misprints; we noticed among others the omission of Dunbar (1650), Edmond Calamy for Edmund (314), Roy for Ray (338), Bishop Wilberforce for William (434), 1877 for 1867 (460). But the book is accurate in the main, and without bias; if it is not as good a history as Trevelyan's, it is a fine achievement.

We are indeed glad that the "Cambridge Miscellany" now includes Prof. Ernest Barker's **Oliver Cromwell and the English People* (Cambridge Press, 3s. 6d.), a lecture delivered in Berlin last December. It is well that Germans should see Cromwell as Prof. Barker's sturdy commonsense and understanding sympathy describe him—a Free Churchman *par excellence* and altogether different from our modern dictators.

Dr. G. B. Harrison has done good service in reprinting **The Narrative of the Persecution of Agnes Beaumont in 1674* (Constable, 3s. 6d.), an intensely vivid account of her spiritual experiences and of a false accusation of murder written by a member of Bunyan's congregation at Bedford. Anyone who does not know this human document—almost as striking as Bunyan's own writing—will be grateful to be introduced to it.

We wish all Congregational churches had an enthusiastic historian like Mr. W. B. Trigg, who has compiled a *History of Providence Congregational Church, Ovenden*. Every church ought to have a little record of this kind, and Ovenden has been fortunate in its chronicler.

Rather to our surprise we have "got more out of" Sir Herbert J. C. Grierson's **Milton and Wordsworth* (Cambridge Press, 8s. 6d.) than out of any other book on our table this quarter. The sub-title of the book is "Poets and Prophets. A Study of Their Reactions to Political Events", and it is in the combination of intimate knowledge of the two poets, their lives, times, and writings, and of modern life and literature that the book makes its strong appeal. The first section of the book, which aims at showing the prophetic nature of true poetry, of Milton's pre-eminently, makes inspiring reading: we see the poet as a "sent man", a "dedicated spirit", and the tone is maintained through the discussion of Milton's prose and verse and its relation to the stirring days in which he lived. We rejoice to see Sir Herbert enthusiastic in his defence of Milton against our modern minnows, and we strongly commend his lectures to our readers. The Wordsworth chapter is not up to the standard of those which precede it: it serves, though this is not the writer's intention, to show that Wordsworth is not "in the same street" as the Puritan poet.

One's first impression on reading Sir John Squire's *The Honeysuckle and the Bee* (Heinemann, 8s. 6d.) is, "Well, that's the easiest way of writing a book ever invented. Anybody could do it". But, of course, anybody couldn't. Few have crowded into a half-century such rich and varied experiences as Sir John, his interests are many and mixed—books, music, sport of many kinds, pictures, walking. He starts to walk to Devon as in his undergraduate days, and tells us what memory and reflection and observation bring to him on the way. The book meanders as the journey

did: we never know what is coming, whether we shall be in this country or another, in this generation or the last, in the world of make believe or of present reality. It is all very enjoyable, even though Sir John is down on "dissent" and evidently accepts—a sad fall from grace—all he has been told about the destructive work of Oliver Cromwell.

The sub-title of Mr. Joseph McCabe's *The Papacy in Politics To-day* (Watts, 7s. 6d.) is "Vatican Plots in Spain and Other Countries". Mr. McCabe claims that

> the Papacy, supported by the national branches of the Church in every country, has used a politico-economic world-movement to destroy its own critics and to check the extraordinary leakage of the last ten years: has, in order to reconcile the world to the violence of that movement, taken the lead in the false cry of persecution of religion and of outrages upon ministers of religion; and has not only not uttered a syllable of moral indignation at the vile outrages and callous glorification of war which have poisoned our age, but has fully, in some cases vitally, supported the offending parties . . .

Mr. McCabe claims that Romanism and Fascism are in close alliance. We shall not be accused of undue sympathy with either of these, but we cannot but regret the tone of Mr. McCabe's chapters—superlatives, dogmatic statements, abuse; how much more effective he would be were he more restrained! Sometimes recent events, as, for example, the recent election in Belgium, make his prophecies look very foolish; and sometimes, in order to denounce Romanism, he has to do an amazing *volte-face,* as when, discussing the immorality of Westphalian friars, he lauds the fairness of the Nazi Courts of Justice.

The deserved success which met Mr. Christopher Hollis's *Foreigners Aren't Fools* is no doubt in some measure responsible for the speedy appearance of the same writer's *We Aren't So Dumb* (Longmans, 6s.), which has been written in such a hurry that an "old Cambridge tutor" is made to say "as neither of you are a woman". Like most sequels, the new book is not equal to its predecessor, but it is both informing and thought-provoking in its discussions of current international problems—colonies, raw materials, India, Japan, Spain, trade restrictions, population, Fascists and Nazis, ideological fronts, America, Ireland, and others.

Mr. Ernest Main's *Palestine at the Cross Roads* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is a vigorous but clear statement of the Jewish case. One cannot but feel as one reads that it is the speech of an advocate and that the Arab side should be heard before a verdict is given. Nevertheless it is good to have a statement so easy to follow as this one. Mr. Main argues that the Jews have proved the cultivability of land the Arabs said could not be cultivated, and have thus shown that Palestine can find a home for many more people. The chapters assessing the progress made in Palestine since the War, from which the Arabs have themselves benefited, are very striking.

Written before the trial of David Frankfurter, the Jewish medical student who shot Gustloff, a Nazi agent in Switzerland, Herr Emil Ludwig's *The Davos Murder* (Methuen, 3s. 6d.) shows how the outrages on the Jews in Germany preyed on a sensitive youth and at last drove him to assassination. Since the book was written Frankfurter has been sentenced to a long term of imprisonment, but it remains an incontrovertible indictment of Nazi brutality.

Miss Helen Nicholson (Baroness de Zglinitzki) has in *Death in the Morning* (Dickson, 5s.) given us a vivid account of life in Granada last

summer, and of the journey *via* Seville to Gibraltar and safety. She writes as one who believes that "International Communism to-day is the most sinister menace that ever threatened our civilization", and that the War in Spain is the result of Russian ideology. Her pages are filled with Red atrocities, though executions by Fascists are admitted. Though there is much about Russians in Spain, there is no mention of Germans, and only one reference to Italians. The horrors of civil war stare at us from these chapters, the last of which contains a thrilling account of a Chilean girl's heroic attempt to save her Spanish husband.

If the industrial problem in South Wales is not solved it will not be for lack of thinking. A survey undertaken with the aid of a grant from the Commissioner of Special Areas has just published its second instalment, *The Second Industrial Survey of South Wales* (University of Wales Press, 3 volumes, 30s.). The first volume deals with Industries, the second with Facilities, and the third with Development. It is impossible here to do more than indicate their contents, but we hope that many Christians outside South Wales will take the trouble to master these volumes so as to obtain a sympathetic and well-informed understanding of the problem they present.

What a pity that in *The Condition of Britain* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.) Mr. and Mrs. G. D. H. Cole do not remain objective throughout and stick to the statement of facts. Those facts speak for themselves, and those who consider them will inevitably come near to the conclusions of the writers, but "savagely", "poisonous", "salaried fascist thug"—such expressions will prevent the facts from having their chance. Statistics, charts, graphs, are furnished in abundance as the Coles deal in turn with "The Rich and Poor", "Health and Nutrition", "The Dwellings of the People", "The Unemployed", "Standards of Life", "The Educational System", "Taxation and the Social Services", "Production", and "The Working-Class Movement"; then they become frankly propagandist in "What is to be Done?". A valuable book of reference for the present day.

Do you know what Chatham House is or what the Royal Institute for International Affairs which is housed there does? If not, your education has been neglected and you should read Commander Stephen King-Hall's *Chatham House* (Oxford Press, 5s.) without delay. In it, in order to raise an Endowment Fund of £250,000, Commander King-Hall outlines the history and the aims, the achievements and plans, of this thinking centre for the British Commonwealth, which exists to collect, examine, and distribute information on imperial and foreign political, economic, and social problems.

It is superfluous to praise the production of a Batsford book. Quite naturally the Coronation has brought contributions from all sides, and one of the most interesting is Mr. Hector Bolitho's *Royal Progress, 1837-1937* (Batsford, 7s. 6d.), a well-illustrated volume dealing with the period from Victoria to George VI.

Two more Batsford books are in the "Face of England" series (7s. 6d.) —Mr. Edmund Vale's *North Country* and Miss Eiluned and Mr. Peter Lewis's *The Land of Wales,* alike in comprising industrial areas and areas of great beauty. One naturally turns to the photographs first: on the whole they are successful, though the head of Windermere is scarcely "typical lakeland". Mr. Vale, though he tells us a good deal, rather misses the mark by jumping here and there among six counties; his sense of proportion, too, is sometimes lacking: two of his 118 pages are taken

up in discussing Cumbrian footraces, which he believes are (and he includes Grasmere Sports) "crooked". With all its diversity of scenery and industry, Wales is yet much more "homogeneous" than "The North", and so the Lewises had an easier task than Mr. Vale. They are successful in conveying a good deal of information, but a lighter touch would have been welcome and more appropriate to a book of this type.

Then, still from Batsfords, we have *England's Greater Churches* (3s. 6d.), in which Mr. C. B. Nicholson writes the Introduction and Notes to some beautiful examples of the photographic art.

Readers who have heard Mr. Harold Nicolson broadcast will eagerly open his volume of essays, *Small Talk* (Constable, 6s.), and they will not be disappointed. Whether in ironic or descriptive mood, meandering pleasantly along or rushing toward the mill race, Mr. Nicolson is always worth reading—or almost always, for when he expatiates on food we find him boring. The papers on various phases of American life are as good as any, though some will prefer "On Telling the Truth" or "A Defence of Shyness". On reading "Coincidences" we felt once again that if Mr. Nicolson is not A. J. Alan he ought to be.

Mr. L. R. McColvin's *Libraries and the Public* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.), the new "Practical Library Handbook", should be read by many besides those engaged in Library administration. Mr. McColvin, who is Chief Librarian at Hampstead, is nothing if not provocative: one chapter, for example, begins:

> No library in this country is sufficiently staffed either as regards quantity or quality.

His comparative figures of American and British towns are staggering, and show the leeway to be made up; and we trust that voters will see that their towns and districts are removed from the black list in the Appendix.

It is a tribute to Mr. S. A. Clark's *Denmark on £10* (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.) that for the first time he has made us think of Denmark for a holiday. This little book is one of the best of the series; Mr. Clark evidently lost his heart to Bornholm, and his pages transmit his enthusiasm. Denmark, he claims, is one of the cheapest countries of Europe for a holiday, and a fortnight can be spent in the country without difficulty for £10.

At times Mr. T. Thompson tempts us to the first column of the back page of the *Manchester Guardian* before we read the news, and it is always with pleasure that we see his name on a book's jacket. *Cuckoo Narrow* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is a story of life's round in a Lancashire town—there are births, marriages, deaths: "hatched, matched, and despatched" as the reporter calls them—and shows the intimate acquaintance with home and factory, inn and street, of Mr. Thompson's previous writings. Joe, a steady reliable working man whose failings never go beyond an occasional pint and a shilling on a horse, is admirably drawn. The only doubt we have is whether Mr. Thompson is right in suggesting that his story relates to post-War days. Everything about it, especially Bob Smith and his girls and his connexions with chapel and music, seem to date from thirty years ago.

In *A Time to Remember* (Constable, 7s. 6d.) Leane Zugsmith—the name fails to convey to us the sex of the writer—has written a story round the employees of a New York departmental store—their lives in the store and at home, and what it seems now the fashion to call their "private lives". One would not like to think that conditions in big stores in America or elsewhere are as described in this book, but there is an authentic touch about

it which suggests that the attempt to get the employees together in a union to fight against intolerable "economic slavery" is based on real life. The writer leaves some of the characters in the air, but the narrative holds the reader.

Mr. James Hilton's *We Are Not Alone* (Macmillan, 6s.) is neither a short story nor a full length novel, but something between, and comparable with *And Now Goodbye* in that it tells of a good man, an unsympathetic wife, a young girl, and the tragedy that ensued. Readers who long for another *Goodbye, Mr. Chips* will be disappointed, even though the story will hold them to the last page.

Mr. Hugh Walpole has made his novel *The Cathedral* into a Play in Three Acts bearing the same title (Macmillan, 3s. 6d.). The play, which is very faithful to the novel, reads well; whether it contains sufficient action to succeed on the stage only experience can show.

EDITOR.

Mr. G. R. Driver's *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System* (Clark, 7s. 6d.) is obviously a book for the specialist in Hebrew, and will rank amongst the leading treatises on the subtleties of Hebrew Grammar. Mr. Driver is probably the greatest English authority in comparative Semitic philology, and has here used his very extensive knowledge of Semitic languages and in particular of Babylonian, to explain those peculiarities in the use of the Hebrew perfect and imperfect tenses which have puzzled the advanced scholar, as well as the beginner in Hebrew. The well-known *Hebrew Tenses* of the author's father, S. R. Driver, was an exhaustive study of the actual usage in the Old Testament, leading to an attractive and indeed fascinating theory of the development of that usage from the picturesque and vivid manner of Hebrew speech. Mr. G. R. Driver follows a different method, and reaches somewhat different conclusions, as to the origin of the usage. He specially appeals to the Babylonian and Aramaean influences, and argues powerfully and in closest detail that these influences affected syntax as well as vocabulary; thus he thinks it probable that the constructions with strong *waw* go back to the Babylonian, and those with weak *waw* to the Aramaean. On these and many other points of linguistic detail, he has contributed important and interesting theories, which will engage the attention of the scholars able to meet the exacting demands this book makes on their learning.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

The latest volume in the "International Library of Christian Knowledge" is Dr. Emil Brunner's *The Philosophy of Religion* (Nicholson & Watson, 6s.), translated by Profs. Farrer and Lee Woolf. The translation has been well done, and it is certainly useful to have Brunner's presentation of the case for the theology of crisis from the philosophical standpoint. The book will enable English readers to form a very intelligent judgment of the position represented by this theology, but whether it will commend it to them is open to question. To begin with, we are not given here a philosophy of religion in the true sense of the words at all. What appears is a philosophy of revelation based on the assumption that the whole subjective approach to religion must be ruled out. There is a great deal, no doubt, in Brunner's onslaught on subjectivism that is both true and timely. But it must not mislead us into imagining that the subjective aspect of revelation can be done away with. If God is to speak to men with any effect, man must be at least capable of hearing His word, and it is hardly possible to envisage man as being so capable without assuming the existence of that natural religion which Brunner, following Barth, denies.

In Brunner's treatment of the subject there is a great deal that is difficult, but a great deal also that is very suggestive. No student of present-day religion can afford to neglect a book like this, even though it is necessary to take its findings with a very considerable grain of salt.

Dr. C. J. Wright's **Modern Issues in Religious Thought* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.) is yet another attempt at theistic and Christian apologetic, and a more useful and pertinent one than many of those that make much greater pretentions. Dr. Wright is impressed by the way in which modern scientific knowledge and theory is now filtering down to the man in the street, and by the obligations of the Christian Church to meet the situation thus created and "to set forth in coherent terms the eternal truth of God in terms of the intellectual *milieu* of the times". He tells us that most of the chapters in his book were originally read to gatherings of ministers of religion and have had the advantage of criticism. They certainly lack nothing in relevance to the situation with which most thoughtful people in these days find themselves confronted. Whether he is dealing with strictly theological questions such as Christology, the Atonement, and the relation of Christianity to dogma and history, or with more general questions like freedom and authority, the aims of science, and the modern universe, he never loses sight of the fact that he has a positive message and that it can be given in Christian terms. The general position to which this leads may be stated in his own words:

> If our human minds have any correspondence with reality, then it follows that we are not debarred from making affirmations which, while inadequate, are true as far as they go. We cannot comprehend God in His completeness and perfection, yet we can say much about Him which is not untrue. While there is that in religion which will always defy final definition, yet the intellectual element in all healthy religion will seek in every age for coherent formulation of belief.

These words might well be taken as the text of a very useful and timely volume.

Mr. George Norville describes his *Testament of a Wayfarer* (Clarke, 3s. 6d.) as "A Business Man's Thoughts of God, Religion, and Life". The thoughts are contained in a series of letters, not very epistolary in form, in which the writer describes his progress from a rather narrow dogmatism to a broader, saner, and more satisfying faith. In the course of his meditations he sets out the modern view of the New Testament, and of theological problems such as Christology and the Atonement. There is nothing very original about his treatment of these subjects, but he writes always brightly and sensibly, and his book would be a useful one to put into the hands of young inquirers.

Dr. E. O. James, who is now well known as an authority on the Comparative Study of Religions, writes *The Origins of Religion* (Unicorn Press, 3s. 6d.) in the "Christian Challenge Series" to enable the man in the street to understand something of the way in which organized religion arose out of the most primitive beginnings. He deals with such questions as the belief in the supernatural, the conception of the soul, the cult of the dead, the worship of heroes and ancestors, and the social implications of religion. These are big subjects and their treatment within the limits of a small book must necessarily be somewhat superficial. Dr. James has succeeded, however, in giving a survey of the field which is as complete as it is compendious. For the ordinary reader there could hardly be a better introduction to the study of the origin and development of religion than this little book.

Dr. W. J. Beale's *Divine Causation* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) is a somewhat unusual and really interesting book. It is a study of man's belief in causal agencies or the causal action of gods, or God, in the universe and in human life. After a long discussion of the evolution of belief in a supreme causal agent, Dr. Beale goes on to describe the influence of agencies like magic, divination, and the work of intermediary beings in the causal process. He then discusses Dualism, Transcendence, Immanence, and the like, and concludes with a statement of the data in the New Testament for the supreme causality of God. It will be seen, therefore, that his book is a contribution to religious anthropology as well as to philosophical theology. Some of his interpretations and conclusions will no doubt be questioned, but the general trend of his argument is fairly convincing. He insists on the necessity of regarding God not merely as the Great First Cause, but as standing in a transcendent immanent causal relation to the universe and to man. Anything less than this, such as the attribution of events to intermediary beings—angels or demons or the like—he regards as definitely unethical and dangerous. He says:

> When from a child's early and most impressionable years the relics of animism are allowed to take the place of the constant cultivation of the immediate presence of God, we have no ground for surprise that among the consequences is a mental separation of ethics from a Christian form of religion.

There are many "relics of animism" in the practices of the Christian churches to-day, and we may be grateful to Dr. Beale for pointing out in one direction at any rate the mischief that they do.

Under the significant title, **Inevitable Congregationalism* (Independent Press, 2s. 6d. & 1s. 6d.), Dr. Albert Peel has republished a number of addresses which he had delivered from time to time on various aspects of our Congregational polity. One of them is the address he gave at Boston in 1920 in presenting the Report of the British Commission on Congregationalism. This Report is a really valuable document and it is good to have it in this convenient and accessible form. The whole volume is indeed most welcome and an excellent antidote to that rather pessimistic spirit in which many Congregationalists are inclined to view both their past and their future. Dr. Peel makes short work of the very common notion that Congregationalism stands merely for democracy in church government and for freedom from the State. It certainly stands for these things, but they are quite secondary to its main principle. That is simply that members of a Christian church must be Christians and that the only head of a Christian church is Jesus Christ Our Lord. It may be quite true that Congregationalism is an ideal system and that it therefore requires ideal men and women to work it. It is none the worse for that, however, and its present needs and plight constitute a challenge to the men and women who form its fellowship to be more diligent in putting into practice the principles which they profess. Dr. Peel quite recognizes that Congregationalism must move with the times and that some modifications in the older form of Independency are desirable. These, however, are best carried out by men and women who are true to those fundamental principles of Congregationalism which are essentially Christian rather than ecclesiastical. It is to be hoped that Dr. Peel's lively and interesting defence and discussion of these principles may be widely read and that they may bear much fruit.

W. B. Selbie.

The Magnet of the Heart, by Robert Menzies (Clarke, 3s. 6d.); *First Commandment,* by Martin Niemöller (Hodge, 6s.); *God's Way of Mercy,* by Vincent McNabb (Burns Oates, 5s.). These three volumes of sermons go well together though they are by preachers of Churches as different as the Church of Scotland, the Lutheran Church, and the Roman Catholic. They all appeal to the things that make the Gospel a living force in the world.

Mr. Menzies' sermons strike a deeply evangelistic note, and at the same time give reasons for his faith. They are an excellent example of pastoral preaching as it has long flourished in Scotland; that is to say they are an example of the pulpit in one of its highest uses.

Dr. Niemöller is widely known for his courage and faith in the troubles through which the German Lutheran Church is passing. These are brave sermons. They reflect, of course, the current controversies which endanger his people. But they are not embittered sermons. They go to the roots of faith; and in doing so they bring home the issues which are at stake. Dr. James Moffatt writes a sympathetic foreword to the book.

Father McNabb is well known as a Mission preacher of the Roman Catholic Church. There is a directness and simplicity about these "verbatim notes" of his "Retreat Instructions" which will make a place for them outside the borders of his own Church. In Mr. Chesterton's *Autobiography* there are pleasant references to Father McNabb, and this volume is dedicated to G. K. Chesterton.

The African papers which the Rev. T. Cullen Young has reprinted under the title *African Ways and Wisdom* (United Society for Christian Literature, 5s.) will be welcomed especially by students of missionary affairs. They will also be of value to all who are interested in Anthropology. Mr. Young covers a wide field of interests; his papers are well written, and they justify his claim that they are "a contribution towards understanding".

In *He Leadeth Me* (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.) the Rev. J. Brice has collected some thirty-four of his devotional studies which have appeared in *Joyful News.* They have a homely and intimate touch about them, and I am sure many will be glad to have them in this more permanent form.

The Rev. H. E. Guillebaud's *Why the Cross?* (Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 2s. 6d.) rather suffers from a too polemical tone; and it is a question if the way to the meaning of the Cross is by being so combative. The book is a defence of the substitutionary view of Christ's death. It claims that no other teaching but this is Scriptural. The author injures his own "fundamentalism" by refusing to see that forms of belief widely different from his own may still be true to the heart of the Gospel.

Prof. R. G. Macintyre's *The Substance of the Christian Faith* (Angus & Robertson, 3s. 6d.) has for its object "to present the Christian faith as simply as possible for busy men and women". It is a book of the kind one is glad to see. Without being difficult, it follows the main stream of current thought. It is the work of a scholarly mind, tolerant and far-seeing. It will be helpful to very many.

The Rev. L. J. Baggott's *This Generation and its Spiritual Needs* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) is a rather more ambitious book than Prof. Macintyre's, but with a similar aim. It deals with the characteristics of the present day, and shows how a Christian faith can meet its needs. Occasionally Mr. Baggott's view of his own times is a little hard on them, and leaves out something which would have had a qualifying effect on his judgment. But he has written a thoughtful book, and it can only do good. Once or twice

I wondered if Mr. Baggott had forgotten that the Christian faith flowers in other gardens besides those of what he calls the "Holy Catholic Church". None of us has a monopoly of the saints.

Mr. Alfred Machin's *Darwin's Theory Applied to Mankind* (Longmans, 7s. 6d.), which has an introductory note by Sir Arthur Keith, rides a useful theory to death. Whatever science may think to-day about natural selection, the theory has its limitations; but Mr. Machin sees it all the way, and sees it in everything. This involves him in a good deal of special pleading. Again and again one is forced to protest that the case is not so simple as all this; and especially to protest that history cannot be written to a doctrinaire theory. I am not surprised that even Sir Arthur Keith boggles at some of it. On the other hand the book contains much that is true. It is instructive and interesting.

In her book *The Divine Concern* (Clarke, 2s. 6d.) Miss Lilian Guise provides in brief "An Outline of Christian Mystical Philosophy". This is a large matter, and I have to confess with regret that there is much in this outline which I do not understand. But one may share Miss Guise's enthusiasm for the Christian mystics, and be grateful for her guidance, though the metaphysics is hard to fathom.

A. T. S. James.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, *ETC.*

Dr. Laurence E. Browne's *From Babylon to Bethlehem* (Heffer, 3s. 6d.) is the "Story of the Jews for the last Five Centuries before Christ". A new volume of "Texts for Students" is *God and His Works* (S.P.C.K., 4s. 6d.), being selections from St. Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologica,* together with some notes on the selection by Fr. A. G. Hebert, of Kelham. Mr. Newman Watts has abridged Robert Demaus's well-known life of *Hugh Latimer* (R.T.S., 1s. 6d.). Mr. Ernest H. Hayes's *The Child in the Midst* has been thoroughly revised and issued in its 6th edition (N.S.S.U., 2s.).

With London's many visitors in view, Mr. H. V. Morton has revised his *London* (Methuen, 5s.) originally published in "The Little Guide" series in 1926. *The New Pacifism* (Allenson, 2s. 6d.) reprints papers by Mr. Gerald Heard and Mr. Aldous Huxley, chapters from work by Mr. A. A. Milne, Mr. Beverley Nichols, and Canon Sheppard, and adds two excellent contributions by Friends. New volumes in the attractive "Oxford Bookshelf" (Oxford Press) are Mr. J. Middleton Murry's *Countries of the Mind* (the two series in one volume, 6s.), and *The Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (5s.).

To the 19th edition of his *Psychology* (Butterworth, 2s. 6d.) in the "Home University Library" Prof. William McDougall adds a new Preface on the developments associated with the names of Spearman, Lloyd Morgan, and the *Gestalt* school.

Three new issues in the "Religion and Life Books" (S.C.M., 1s.) are Canon C. E. Raven's *The Quest of Religion,* the Rev. M. Watcyn-Williams's *The Beatitudes in the Modern World,* and Dr. Sherwood Eddy's *Sex and Youth.* A second impression of Mr. Hilaire Belloc's *Characters of the Reformation* (Sheed & Ward, 7s. 6d.), first published last year, now appears. His character-sketches of the main personalities in the "catastrophe" and "tragedy" of the Reformation (which is responsible for the "modern chaos") will for ever be a shocking example of what prejudice can do.

The higher critic will enjoy himself in comparing Mr. Basil Maine's *Edward VIII—Duke of Windsor* (Hutchinson, 3s. 6d.) with the same writer's *The King's First Ambassador,* on which it is based. Mr. Maine is appreciative rather than critical of the Duke's character and work, and comparatively little space is given to the abdication and its causes. There are many illustrations and extracts from speeches.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, *ETC.*

Canon Storr's *How the Bible has Come Down to Us* (S.P.C.K., 2d.) is an admirable summary which ministers would do well to recommend to their people. *Religion: Fact or Fancy?* (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.) contains four talks broadcast by Dr. L. W. Grensted. The celebration of the 100th anniversary of the death of Charles Simeon was held in Cambridge last November. Twelve addresses then delivered by the Archbishop of Canterbury, several Bishops, and other clergy are printed in *Charles Simeon* (Lutterworth Press, 1s.). *The Functions of an International Equity Tribunal* (New Commonwealth, 6d.) contains the proposals of the New Commonwealth Society, which also publishes *Industry and War* (3d.), a speech by Mr. Arthur Chamberlain. Dr. Alex. Wood's *Some Implications of Modern Physics* (Independent Press, 4d.) is a lecture delivered to the Modern Free Churchmen's Union in May, 1936. Mr. Shipley N. Brayshaw's *The Total Abolition of Unemployment* (Allen & Unwin, 1s.) follows up his Swarthmore Lecture of 1933.

Recently we have had other lectures which should by no means be overlooked. They include Mr. Harold Nicolson's Rede Lecture, *Prestige* (Cambridge Press, 2s.), Sir Richard Livingstone's Essex Hall Lecture, *Veracity* (Lindsey Press, 1s.), Dr. Stanton Coit's Conway Memorial Lecture, *The One Sure Foundation for Democracy* (Watts, 2s.), and Mr. E. F. Carritt's Hertz Lecture, *An Ambiguity of the Word "Good"* (Oxford Press, 1s. 6d.). A pamphlet by "A Church Trustee" on *Church Trusts and Trustees* (Lindsey Press, 6d.), though written for Unitarian Chapels, is not without its value for other Free Churchmen. Of political pamphlets we have Prof. D. C. Fabricius's *Positive Christianity in the Third Reich* (Dresden : Puschel), a booklet for those "millions of German people who are real Christians and at the same time good National Socialists, unswervingly loyal to their Führer". "A German on Contemporary Britain" is Prof. Adolf Löwe, *The Price of Liberty* in the "Day to Day Pamphlets" (Hogarth Press, 1s. 6d.). In the same series is Mr. L. B. Pekin's *The Military Training of Youth,* "An enquiry into the aims and effects of the O.T.C.", which all who have been diddled by the statement that O.T.C's are educational and not military should read. The "New Commonwealth" publishes Lord Davies's *The Commonwealth of Nations* (4d.) and Major-General Sir Henry Thuillier's *The Menace from the Air and the Remedy* (3d.). The Cobden Club issues Mr. C. J. L. Brock's *The Moral Case for Free Trade* (Cobden-Sanderson, 6d.). Of strictly religious pamphlets we have the Congregational Union's *A Summons to Action* (Indep. Press, 3d.), published by the Life and Work Committee; Messrs. G. A. Gollock and T. C. Young's "Bible Studies for African Christians", *God's Family in the World* (U.S.C.L., 6d.); the Rev. A. M. Stibbs's *Search the Scriptures,* the Inter-Varsity Fellowship Study Course (I.V.F., 1s.), and from the same publishers Dr. D. M. McIntyre's *Some Notes on the Synoptic Problem* (6d.). The Rev. E. A. Payne's *Marianne Lewis and Elizabeth Sale* (Carey Press, 3d.) tells of pioneers of missionary work among women. The L.M.S. is to be congratulated on its "On the Spot" booklets (3d. each), though the reference to tree-climbers is duplicated on pp. 12 and 25

in Dr. Howard Somervell's *Healing in India.* The others are the Rev. R. J. B. Moore's *Africa at the Mines*, and the Rev. A. P. Cullen's *Making China's Men.*

Mr. Philip I. Unwin's *Unwiniana, 1937* (Allen & Unwin, 2s.) contains further researches into the antiquities of the widespread and ancient Unwin family. *Thomas Phillips, 1868-1936* (Carey Press, 6d.) is a brief anonymous memoir which tells of the Welsh boy's call to the ministry, his pastorates in Kettering, Norwich, and Bloomsbury, and his Principalship of Cardiff Baptist College.

ALSO RECEIVED.

BARBARA G. STONE. *Milestones in Palestine.* Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d. Illustrated. "The story of the Journeys of Jane and John in Palestine."

"LAMPLIGHTER." *Signs Which He Did.* Burns, Oates. 3s. 6d. Stories from St. John's Gospel for children told in the environment of a Roman Catholic family. The work of a "Holy Child" nun.

"A LONDON JOURNALIST." *First Things First.* U.S.C.L. 1s. Ten Papers described as "Vital Messages Straight from the Shoulder".

HEBE SPAULL. *France; The United States of America.* S.C.M. 1s. 6d. each. The first volumes in the "Life in Other Lands" series. Written for young people from the League of Nations angle.

Report of a Religious Delegation to Spain, April, 1937. Gollancz. 6d. The report of the Dean of Canterbury's delegation.

A. G. INGLEBY. *Pioneer Days in Darkest Africa.* Pickering. 2s. 6d.

W. L. WILSON. *The Romance of a Doctor's Visits.* Pickering. 1s.

TOM JONES. *Living in the Ministry of Song.* Pickering. 2s. 6d.

D. G. BARNHOUSE. *God's Methods for Holy Living.* Pickering. 1s.

J. O. SANDERS. *The Divine Art of Soul-Winning.* Pickering. 1s.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (April). Canon B. H. Streeter replies, not very effectively, to Barth's strictures on the Oxford Movement. Dr. E. L. Allen writes on "Pascal and Kierkegaard", Dr. A. W. Harrison on "Thomas Cooper and the Chartist Movement", Mr. E. E. Kellett on "More Scriptural Idioms in English"; Mr. George Lansbury has an appreciation of Lax, and Dr. E. Eaton Burch's "The Moral Elements in Defoe's Fiction" makes an interesting study.

The Hibbert Journal (April). Prof. J. H. Muirhead discusses the Archbishop of Canterbury's call to the nation, and Colonel T. B. Luard tells us why he does not go to church. Dr. Garvie makes a spirited reply to Dr. Micklem, and another Congregational contributor is Mr. S. H. Moore on "Miguel de Unamuno". Among other writers are Mr. J. A. Spender ("History Perverted into Propaganda"), Mr. M. Chaning Pearce, and Dr. F. A. M. Spencer. Dr. Dawes Hicks surveys recent philosophical literature.

The Baptist Quarterly (April). Dr. Percy Stocks discusses "The Future of the White Race", the Rev. Carey Bonner continues his studies of Baptist hymnists, and Dr. Whitley has a first article on "Baptists and the Bible". The Rev. A. M. Ritchie writes on "Our Public Worship".

The Layman (April). An interesting number, in which Mr. Norman F. Spurr continues his study of the Church and Films, Mr. H. R. Pratt Boorman describes a visit to Russia, and Mr. J. E. Green writes on "The Church Organist". The Baptists are fortunate in having a journal of this kind.

The Modern Churchman (March-May). Lively issues which reveal to some extent the recent division of opinion in the Modern Churchman's Union. An informing article deals with the history of the Union from 1898 to 1923. Among other articles are Mr. J. W. Poynter's "The 'Index of Forbidden Books' ", the Rev. J. C. Hardwick's "Towards a New Technique", the Rev. Geoffrey Allen's "The Religion of Healthy-Mindedness", and Dr. Major's "The Permanent and the Passing in the Pauline Gospel".

The Church Quarterly Review (April-June). Prof. Claude Jenkins describes English scenes and names in the Register of Simon of Ghent, Canon Addleshaw writes on Anna Seward, the Rev. George Every on Bernard Gilpin, Mr. L. F. O'Connor suggests a repertoire of music for Cathedrals, and Mr. W. M. Waddams discusses "Recent Developments in Swedish Theology and Church Life".

The Expository Times (April-June). The "Best Books" articles deal with Worship (Dr. N. Micklem), the Psychology of Religion (Prof. Atkinson Lee), and the Kingdom of God (Dr. W. F. Howard). Dr. Howard and Dr. A. C. Welch continue the discussion on "The Teaching of Theology". Among Congregational contributors are Dr. Garvie ("The Value of the Old Testament for the Christian Church") and Dr. Hywel Hughes ("Recent Trends in Mystical Thought").

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Fourth Month). The most interesting section of this number consists of half-a-dozen articles on "What Does Quakerism Mean to Me?" They are written by Dr. Cuthbert Dukes, Prof. G. B. Jeffery, Mr. J. Rowntree Gillett, Marjorie C. Hume, Mr. E. B. Castle of Leighton Park School, and Amy E. Wallis.

The Christian Quarterly (April). The chief articles are Dr. A. Campbell Garnett's "Faith and Symbol" and Mr. Hovhannes Apkarian's "The Romance of an Alphabet".

The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (April). A rich and varied number includes articles on Richard Rolle (Dr. S. J. F. Arnould), the "Dark Comedies" (Prof. H. B. Charlton), Sumerian Civilization (Dr. T. Fish), Imagery in Mental Processes (Prof. T. H. Pear), Dante (Mr. W. H. V. Reade), and the Library's Semitic MSS. (Dr. Edward Robertson). Dr. Dodd offers detailed proof that the author of *I John* is not the author of the *Gospel of John*.

The International Review of Missions (April). The Rev. W. Machin on "Christian Reunion" and the Rev. G. E. Phillips on "Christian Missions: the Next Chapter", are well worth reading. Archdeacon L. S. Hunter writes on "The Church and the Ministry", and there is an interesting article on "The Ministry in Hinduism" by Dr. D. J. Fleming.

World Dominion (April). Mr. Kenneth Grubb discusses the "Meaning of Evangelization", the Rev. J. Ireland Hasler writes on "The Changed Attitude in India", and the Rev. G. A. Young on the capture of Chiang Kai-shek, while the Rev. Alexander McLeish has another letter about effective missionaries.

Social Service Review (March-May). Statistics and facts of value to all Social Workers. Prof. Ernest Barker's "Community Development in the New Estates" in the May issue is important.

The Common Room (March). The *pièce de resistance* of this issue is Sir Richard Livingstone's "Some Suggestions on Method in Adult Education".

Religion in Education (April). Teachers will find a good many valuable articles in this issue, which contains Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley on "The Synagogue", Dr. Theodore H. Robinson on "Amos", Dr. A. J. W. Myers on "The Place of the Bible in Christian Education", and Mr. B. W. T. Handford on " 'Revolutionising' our New Testament Teaching".

Religion in Life (Spring). We are inclined to think this interesting journal would be improved had it fewer contributors and one or two longer articles. Again the contributors make a distinguished list which includes Dr. J. Edgar Park, our former American correspondent, Dr. John A. Mackay, Dr. H. P. Van Dusen, Dr. H. C. Robbins, Dr. E. M. Ligon, the Rev. R. Birch Hoyle, and the Rev. J. C. Bennett. The reviews seem rather too uniformly appreciative—all literary geese are not swans.

The Harvard Theological Review (April). Mr. William Thomson's "The Renascence of Islam" begins with an apology for the title. The article is really a study of recent movements in Islam. The other articles are Mr. Lewis Hanke's "Pope Paul III and the American Indians", and Mr. Harold Mattingly's "The Roman 'Virtues' ".

The Yale Review (Spring). Of the political articles, the most interesting is Mr. J. Truslow Adams's "What Happens to a Party when it makes a Sweep". Others deal with "Unemployment and Recovery", the Philippines, and "Labour Problems in our Steamship Business". Mme. Cilette Ofaire has some vivid letters written from a Spanish Outpost in recent months. There are two stories by Mr. Paul Horgan and Maxim Gorki, and Ivan Bunin has an article on Gorki.

The Review and Expositor (April). The main article is Dr. T. B. Birch's "Informing vs. Reforming, Erasmus vs. Luther". There is a timely study of "Father Divine" and the Rev. G. S. Dobbins continues "Facing Pastoral Problems".

Anglican Theological Review (April). Mr. C. M. Addison compares Juliana of Norwich with Robert Browning, but most of this issue is given to papers in preparation for a Church Congress, the subject of which is "The Basis for Christian Faith and Action To-day".

The Review of Religion (March). This number contains four articles—Prof. Raffaele Pettazzoni's "A Functional View of Religions", Prof. J. C. Archer's "Samkara and the Hindu One", Prof. E. W. Lyman's "Bergson's Philosophy of Religion", and Prof. B. E. Meland's "The Faith of a Mystic Naturalist". The reviews are good, but very belated: some of the books have been published something like two years.

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin (January). Two valuable articles in this seminary magazine are Mr. F. O. Erb's "Illustrated Bibles", and Mr. Clyde Buckingham's " 'Relief' in Medieval England".

Religious Digest (April). This magazine contains excerpts from the Press of all the world. Sometimes items are given in full, sometimes in condensed form.

World Christianity (Second Quarter). This second number of another digest maintains the promise of the first number. Japan, Russia, Germany, all have their place, the latter being represented by Dr. Martin Niemöller's "What We Mean by the Confessional Church".

CORRESPONDENCE.

My Dear Editor,—As you have been kind enough to make reference to my 1913 volume, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament,* perhaps it will interest my fellow-Congregationalists if I make a brief statement.

The series "Studies in Theology" was started under the editorship of the late Dr. Stuart J. Reid and myself and continued under our editorship till about the beginning of the Great War, when the publishers found editors no longer necessary. As co-editor I carefully read the proofs of each pre-war volume. Both the publisher and the new editor of the series appear to have been lacking in courtesy in not informing me that a volume was to appear in the series which *to some extent* overlaps with mine. But my old friend Sir Frederic Kenyon must be completely exonerated, because he was not aware till after his book was published that mine had appeared in the same series. I do not think in fact that Sir Frederic's volume is intended to supersede mine. So far as the Greek MSS. are concerned, it naturally does supersede it, but whereas, for example, nearly half my book deals with the Canon, that subject does not fall within Sir Frederic's purview at all. I have been collecting materials since 1913 for a new edition of my own book, which has been very well received on both sides of the Atlantic, but the publisher has never called for a new edition. I have no financial interest in it.

Yours very sincerely,
A. Souter.

King's College,
Aberdeen.